DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 540 CE 069 757

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Ohio Job Training. Hearing on Fundamental Re-Examination of Our Programs That Train America's Workers of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. United States Senate, One Hundred Fourth Congress, First Session (Columbus, OH). |
| INSTITUTION | Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. |
| REPORT NO | ISBN-0-16-047455-8; Senate-Hrg-104-91 |
| PUB DATE | 2 Jun 95 |
| NOTE | 82p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402. |
| PUB TYPE | Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC04 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Adult Basic Education; *Adult Vocational Education; Correctional Education; Disabilities; Disadvantaged; Displaced Homemakers; *Educational Needs; Educational Trends; *Education Work Relationship; Employment Programs; Financial Support; Futures (of Society); Government School Relationship; Hearings; *Job Training; *Labor Force Development; Labor Needs; Manufacturing Industry; Public Policy; Retraining; School Business Relationship; Secondary Education; Service Occupations; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges; Vocational Rehabilitation; Welfare Recipients; Womens Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | Congress 104th; Job Corps; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Ohio |

ABSTRACT

These Congressional hearings contain testimony pertaining to the future of job training in Ohio. Among the topics discussed are the following: the job training needs of selected special needs groups, including convicted felons on probation, dislocated workers, displaced homemakers, unemployed individuals, underskilled employees, disadvantaged individuals, disabled individuals, and welfare recipients; private sector and federal government roles in job training; public policies creating disincentives to seek training and employment; and cooperation between the business and educational sectors. The following are among the agencies and organizations whose representatives provided testimony at the hearings: Court of Common Pleas; Zagar, Inc.; Hollaender Manufacturing; The George Gund Foundation; Jobs Plus Employment Network; Job Corps; Centers for Independent Living; Ohio Restaurant Association; Ladders for Success; Ohio Department of Employment Services; Ohio Board of Regents; Ohio Department of Development; Ohio Department of Education; Ohio Rehabilitation Commission; Eastland Vocational School District; Adult Education Division and Postsecondary Adult Vocational Education Division, Ohio Vocational Association; Postsecondary Adult Vocational Education Division, Ohio and American Vocational Association; Springfield-Clark Joint Vocational School; and Ohio Women Work. (MN)

CE

S. HRG. 104-91

# OHIO JOB TRAINING

## HEARING

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

FUNDAMENTAL RE-EXAMINATION OF OUR PROGRAMS THAT TRAIN AMERICA'S WORKERS

JUNE 2, 1995
COLUMBUS, OH

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

ED 386 540

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
91-525 CC WASHINGTON : 1995

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-047453-8

CE 069757



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas, *Chairman*

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
BILL FRIST, Tennessee
MIKE DeWINE, Ohio
JOHN ASHCROFT, Missouri
SPENCER ABRAHAM, Michigan
SLADE GORTON, Washington

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
PAUL WELLSTONE, Minnesota

SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Staff Director*
NICK LITTLEFIELD, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

# CONTENTS

## STATEMENTS

FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1995

COLUMBUS, OH.


| | Page |
|---|---|
| DeWine, Hon. Mike, a U.S. Senator from the State of Ohio, opening statement | 1 |
| Stratton, Hon. Evelyn, Judge, Court of Common Pleas | 3 |
| Hanigan, William, vice president of administration and human resources, Zagar, Inc., Euclid, OH; Ron Bush, employee, Hollaender Manufacturing, Fostoria, OH; Daniel Berry, associate director, The George Gund Foundation, Cleveland, OH; and Douglas B. Robinson, executive director, Jobs Plus Employment Network, Cincinnati, OH | 4 |
| Hernandez, Gabriella, JTPA Student of the Year for Ohio, Doug Aydelott, center director, Dayton Job Corps; Sandra Green, Partnership, OH; Lisa Corbett, Centers for Independent Living, Cincinnati, OH; and Ninia Downs, executive director of government programs, Ohio Restaurant Association, and program director, Ladders For Success | 25 |
| Tompkins, Arnold, Ohio Department of Human Services; Debra Bowland, administrator of human services, Ohio Department of Employment Services; Elaine Hairston, Ohio Board of Regents; Joe Robertson, Ohio Department of Development; John Goff, Ohio Department of Education; and Robert Rabe, Ohio Rehabilitation Commission | 51 |
| Green Thumb, Inc., Kent Kahn, State director in Ohio, prepared statement | 71 |
| Eastland Vocational School District, Adult Education Division and the Postsecondary Adult Vocational Education Division of the Ohio Vocational Association, Bill Bussey, director of adult education, on behalf of, prepared statement | 73 |
| Weber, Larry H., president, Postsecondary Adult Vocational Education Division (PAVE) of the Ohio and American Vocational Association, prepared statement | 75 |
| Kelly, Peggy, displaced homemaker coordinator, Springfield-Clark JVS, and president, Ohio Women Work!, prepared statement | 76 |

# OHIO JOB TRAINING

**Friday, June 2, 1995**

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
*Columbus, OH.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:00 a.m. in Studio 3, The Vern Riffe Center, 77 South High Street, Columbus, OH, Senator Mike DeWine presiding.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR DEWINE

Senator DEWINE. Good morning and welcome to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee field hearing on the future of job training in the United States.

Five years from now, we are going to enter a new century and a new millennium. How well Ohio does in that new millennium will depend on how well-prepared our workforce is for the new challenges we are going to face. Unless we take action very soon, our workforce is going to have a major handicap in its effort to compete.

What I am referring to is America's number one social problem: The young people who are growing up outside the market economy. Too often, discussions of job training focus on how to cushion the blow for workers who have been displaced by a changing market, and that is an important problem; but an even bigger problem is the growing number of Americans who are outside the economy completely. Some people call them at-risk youth. I think that is a severe understatement. To say that they are at-risk implies that they have a lot greater chance in life than they really do.

If we let these young people slip away, if we let a whole class of Americans grow up without any realistic hope of earning a living, America is simply not going to be able to stay on top of the global competition. Even worse: It is not going to be the kind of place we would want our children to live in. We need to reach out to the at-risk people. We need to bring these people into what we recognize as the American Way of Life. That is my major concern in this hearing today.

We have a historic opportunity to tackle this kind of fundamental issue. Because today, at the Federal level, Congress is engaged in a truly basic debate about what government should do in this country—and which level of government is best equipped to do which particular tasks.

At a time when just about every line item in the budget is open to debate, when we are about to embark on a far-reaching and historic welfare reform effort, I think it is only right that we engage

in a fundamental re-examination of our programs that train America's workers. That is what this field hearing is all about.

Next Wednesday, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee will meet in Washington to begin consideration of the Workplace Development Act of 1995. This bill has been developed by the Committee Chairman, Senator Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas, to streamline America's Federal job training programs to prepare our working people for the jobs of the future.

We are here today to get some input from the people on the front lines, to investigate what works and what does not work as far as job training programs are concerned. The Federal government today spends $25 billion a year on an array of job training programs.

We have, currently in place, the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation program, Job Opportunities and Basic Skills, and the Job Training Partnership Act; and that is just the "Big Four". There are at least 164 other Federal job training programs in this country.

It seems that every time a weakness or a deficiency has been pointed out in job training, Congress has responded by creating a new program. It's not so easy to create the kind of fundamental change that is necessary to make sure the programs really meet national needs.

That is why the opportunity before us, in this hearing today, is so exciting. We can get past the programs and start talking about the people. What do the American people really need in terms of job training programs, and how can we make sure they get it?

To begin with, it is becoming clear that at least some measure of consolidation of these 168 Federal funded programs is necessary if we are going to have a truly effective national effort on job training. It is equally clear that the broad goal of our job training legislation should be to ensure more flexibility for the states while making sure that the people get the help they need.

How do we do that? Obviously, the solution isn't going to come out of Washington, DC. It has to be based on the experience and expertise of the people we will be hearing from today.

I have asked three distinctive panels to join us here today to help answer these questions. Our first panel will focus on the private sector's role in job training.

The second panel will focus on the people I consider the key target populations of job training programs: At-risk youth and disabled Americans.

The third panel will get into the nitty-gritty of State administration of these programs.

The long-term goal is to have all Americans participate in America. The only way we are going to get that kind of full participation in the benefits of our society and our economy is if we reach out to the at-risk population, and we need to do it soon. I think that the debate over the job training legislation gives us a terrific opportunity to give these people the attention they so desperately need.

And never forget: These are people we are talking about. People who have a lot to offer this country, if we take the time to focus on how we can bring them into the America we know as the place of opportunity.

These are some very serious problems we have to solve. We have a very full agenda, so we will now get started.

Before we turn to panel one, let me ask Judge Evelyn Stratton to come forward. The Judge heard about our hearing today and would like to make a brief statement to the panel. Good morning, Judge.

**STATEMENT OF HON. EVELYN STRATTON, JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS**

Judge STRATTON. I am too late to get in on any of your panels, but I want to throw in a few comments about a group that is not a real popular group right now, so I feel I need to speak for them, and that is convicted felons on probation. I am a judge in Common Pleas Court and I deal with this population. At any one time I have anywhere between 400 and 600 probationers. Now we have 16 judges, so you multiply that by 60 and then multiply that by 88 counties and you see you have a large population of probationers who are in the felony system.

The majority of my probationers are ages 18 to 25. They are young males. They have come from broken homes. Often, they are dealing crack as a way of survival. They have no job skills and they are not even on unemployment—the majority are not even on unemployment, they are just simply unemployed. But, they are very able-bodied young people that we ought to be able to reach, because if we do not, they will end up in front of people like me.

So, I ask that you seriously look, at the conclusion of this program, at some kind of training program that we can put people in, that we can put people on probation into.

The average sentence that I give out is between 6 months and 2 years. Many of those go on probation. The serious offenses are really in a whole different category, and I am not even really talking about that.

I am talking about the young able-bodied person we ought to be able to reach and provide training to. It is very difficult for me to order them to go out and look for a job when the most they can find is $5 an hour, and they can make two to five hundred dollars a day on the street selling crack.

So, we need job incentives for this group. It is very much the at-risk group you are talking about, and it is in Ohio that we have the fourth highest prison population in the country.

So, I ask you not to lose sight of them. It is not a popular group right now, but do not lose sight of them.

I will be happy to put some statistics together for you immediately to help you think about that area in this whole discussion.

Senator DEWINE. Judge, thank you very much for bringing that point to our attention. As you know, Ohio now has 40,000 people incarcerated in our prison system. If you add the number of people in our county jails, we are probably pushing 50,000 people incarcerated on any one given date. If we count the juveniles, that is a huge, as you point out, Judge Stratton, a huge number.

The vast majority of these individuals are coming back out into society at some point. Many of them have, as you point out, substance abuse problems. We estimate 70 percent of them do. Most of them are well behind in their educational attainment.

So, this is—as you are defining at-risk population, this is certainly an at-risk population. It is a group of individuals who may not be popular to concentrate on, but in society's own self-interest, we simply have to do that.

So, I appreciate very much your testimony.

Let me start with our panel. Let me again remind our audience that this first panel is a broad topic, and we are not going to limit anybody to what they are talking about or what they want to tell us; but the broad topic is the private sector in job training.

Let me briefly introduce the panel. I will be brief every time I introduce the panel because I want to allow as much time as possible for the panel and as much time as possible for questions.

From my right, we have William Hanigan, Zagar, Incorporated, machine tool manufacturing, in Euclid, Ohio.

Next to Mr. Hanigan is Ron Bush, employee, Hollaender Manufacturing in Fostoria, Ohio.

Dan Berry is the next witness from George Gund Foundation, an Associate Director in Cleveland, Ohio.

To my immediate left, far left, is Burr Robinson, Jobs Plus Employment Network, Executive Director, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Hanigan, let's start with you.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM HANIGAN, VICE PRESIDENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES, ZAGAR, INC., EUCLID, OHIO; RON BUSH, EMPLOYEE, HOLLAENDER MANUFACTURING, FOSTORIA, OHIO; DANIEL BERRY, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, THE GEORGE GUND FOUNDATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO; AND DOUGLAS B. ROBINSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JOBS PLUS EMPLOYMENT NETWORK, CINCINNATI, OHIO**

Mr. HANIGAN. Thank you. Senator DeWine and members of this hearing, my name is William Hanigan. I am Vice President of Administration and Human Resources of Zagar, Incorporated, a machine tool manufacturer in Euclid, Ohio.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present the ENJSC views of the role of the private sector in job training. With the diversity of Ohio industry, these hearings could not have been held in a more ideal microcosm of America.

First, the ENJSC supports the concept of folding the numerous training programs into one comprehensive program. As an employer representative on Governor Voinovich's Human Resources Advisory Council, we were charged with determining the scope of the numerous training and employment programs in Ohio.

In May of 1992, the Governor's council published "Windows of Opportunity". This publication identified 15 State agencies, 51 programs offering training services. It was clear that the numerous conflicting regulations of the programs and oversight committees created barriers to employers in accessing such resources.

Employers and applicants would benefit from consolidation of training. This effort would reduce administrative costs, solve the eligibility, and assist in the centralization of information and services.

The block grant approach to consolidation is a positive step forward diminishing control from the Federal government and increasing State and local flexibility. Local control should provide the

focus for government training programs. Although we support consolidation efforts, employers do have several concerns.

Any consolidation effort must not restrict universal access to services by employer and applicant alike.

System needs to be private-sector driven to ensure it is flexible and responsive to the evolving dynamics of the labor market, international competition, and technological advances over the coming years.

All training programs must be focused on, and funding based on, the ability to make participants job ready and job experienced through skill-based training.

Funding based solely on the number of participants who successfully complete a program does little to ensure a person finds or keeps a job; the long-term nature of placement should be emphasized in a training program performance-based funding initiative.

We are also concerned that consolidation must not encumber multistate corporations or those businesses residing on the boarder between states or local service delivery areas from obtaining services.

Small business participation should be built into the system, with the small business owners or representatives participating in the controlling board.

It is also imperative that we separate the Federal role in job training from that of serving the unemployed, but job-ready. Employers have strong concerns over the focus on individual training rather than the placement of job-ready applicant.

The monetary training enticement emphasizes the need for service providers to prove their training program through the placement of trainees at the expense and continued unemployment of the skilled job-ready candidate.

This is why employers do not want the Employment Service included in a job training block grant. Such inclusion of the ES in job training would sever its linkage with the unemployment service system, which is critical to application of the unemployment insurance work-test and could result in higher outlays for unemployment benefits.

There has always been a linkage between UI payments and ES registrants; and that is why employment services, which is providing a labor exchange, are authorized the same statute as the unemployment insurance administration.

Returning jobseekers back to work quickly keeps UI benefits down and helps both employers and the Federal government.

The labor exchange is the employers greatest assurance that laid-off workers, drawing unemployment compensation benefits, are returning to work as quickly as possible.

Now, one area of operations that is best served by the Federal government is the labor exchange. A labor market information system must be a national system and not a dysfunctional conglomeration of independent State data information systems. A uniform national framework of data collection and dissemination would ensure comparability of information and consistent definitions.

Many of our larger employers have multistate operations and need a single job match system attuned to address the specific job openings offered by their local divisions throughout the Nation.

Whether it be information about job opportunities or qualified applicant availability, the system must remain flexible and accessible if it is to be effective.

Employers have embraced the One-Stop Career Center concept for this very reason. It would provide a clearinghouse of information to employers and applicants alike.

Job Banks have been touted as a means to have employer job listings easily accessible to job applicants, but that is only half the equation.

The Talent Bank or a repository of information about people seeking work is important to those employers seeking workers. Both systems must be accessed remotely.

One-Stop should not denote a person's physical presence at a location, but instead an information and service source flexible enough to change structure so as to meet employers' needs.

As you know, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act was established to fund the Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service, including the Veterans Programs. These dollars, as well as State UI trust fund dollars, are dedicated funds, dedicated only for those specific administrative and benefit payment purposes.

In recent years, the accumulated balances in these funds have been used to offset artificially the Federal deficit. At no time should the Federal government look to these funds or the Federal government to create additional funding for programs by merging existing dedicated funds with General Revenue Funds.

It is for that reason we urge there be a clear accounting for all expenditures made against the Federal Unemployment Tax Account. The primary goal of the unemployment compensation system must remain the temporary support of unemployed workers as they actively seek new employment.

On another funding issue employers oppose the continuance of the 0.2 percent FUTA surtax and requests its immediate repeal. This 1976 temporary surtax repaid the debt in 1987 and has been extended for purposes other than the FUTA trust fund. Employers have long since fulfilled their obligation in the contract. We believe Congress should act accordingly.

Employers hope that the new legislation is sincere in reducing the government's role in job training by allowing employers to decide, without restrictive tax codes and regulations, to enhance current employees' job skills and competencies.

The government's on-again/off-again programs encumber the employers' ability to develop long-range training programs for their employees.

A prime example is the 1994 expiration of an Internal Revenue Code, Subsection 127, Educational Assistance Plans.

Tuition reimbursement for job-related classes are still excludable as a working condition fringe benefit; however, to qualify as a job-related class, the class must maintain or improve the employee's job skills, or it is necessary for the employee to retain the employment or current compensation.

Unfortunately, under this type of program, a machinist seeking an engineering degree may not be eligible for an English course as part of the curriculute. A job related class does not help the underemployed situation in new and emerging areas.

We believe that a stronger effort needs to be placed on the retention of under-skilled employees and the promotion of training toward high efficiency workers. Employers should not be restricted from expanding employees' potential in either income or job security.

Employers are also concerned that states which possess the highest levels of employment are penalized in the funding stream. Ohio, for example, is one of these.

Focus on those out of work fails to take into account where the job resides. A funding formula responsive to the states whose industries are growing must be considered.

Employers are the customers in the training system. It is our jobs which determine the types of training provided to potential candidates. The design of a new system that is market-based and customer-driven can only be achieved if the local training providers meet customer expectation.

In designing the local workforce training boards, we advocate a super majority role for employers. But, in defining a private sector employer, one who would sit on the governing board, we would take great concern over the party-in-interest provider.

If 20 percent of employer's revenues is generated by government training funds, directly or indirectly, it is our belief that they should not serve on the local, State, or Federal board in the role of an employer. This would not exclude them serving in another capacity, if such classification were appropriate.

Employers should not be restricted to owners or plant managers. Human resources professionals conduct job reviews, determine job skills, draft job descriptions, interview and develop training curriculum. Such employer representatives should be encouraged to participate.

Chambers of Commerce and other recognized employer organizations must take active roles in determining membership on the training boards. The employers on the training boards need to be reflective of the diversity of industry in the local area. Whether it be large or small, retail or manufacturing, an appropriate mix will ensure any employer a training board representative with similar paradigms.

I have only outlined a few of what is in this statement and recognize the time element involved, and am very willing to answer any of your questions, and I thank you very much for the opportunity to express an employer's view.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. I want to ask you one or two questions, and then we will move on and come back to the panel.

You talked about the need to make sure that the labor market information systems are national and not fragmented among 50 states. I wonder what your opinion is of the current system?

Mr. HANIGAN. What we are developing is a fragmented system. There are many programs now being developed such as the Job Banks and Talent Banks, kiosk system, Virginia has developed one, there are others being developed, Ohio is developing another.

Although there is a need for the creativity of the many, there needs to be fundamental definitions set forth so one program or one

set of—one information system can, in fact, communicate with another.

It is very important for employers who reside on the boarder of Ohio and Indiana, for example, that are drawing employees from both states, be able to use both centers, job centers, whether they are in Ohio or Indiana; and therein lies the importance of such linkage.

Senator DEWINE. As this committee drafts legislation, what specific recommendation do you have? Understanding that this bill is certainly not finalized at this point, but also understand we are moving to consolidation to some degree. What should be in this bill to deal with this?

Mr. HANIGAN. I think there needs to be some recognition of what the skill boards have been doing. There are several employer organizations currently coming together: The Association of Manufacturing Technology, NMTA Association, writing specific skills under programs currently out there to develop a common language or program.

From that, we can derive a, if you would, a datacom and skill-based matrix that would be uniform, not only between Ohio and its neighboring states, but across the country.

That type of similar definition of what it is and what a worker is to do, what our job is to do, I think, would benefit not only the employer, but the worker as well. I think the common definitions are critical across the State lines. I am not sure if that clarifies——

Senator DEWINE. So, as we write the legislation, you would support then, I assume, a requirement from the Federal government to the states in regard to making a format?

Mr. HANIGAN. I am not talking about being prescriptive, because at the local level there will be employer needs that are different. But, I believe base information, the way it is gathered, the way it is stored, and the way in which it could be accessed has to be uniform.

Senator DEWINE. Mr. Bush, good morning.

Mr. BUSH. Good morning, sir. How are you?

Senator DEWINE. Fine. It is your turn.

Mr. BUSH. All right. My name is Ron Bush. I am a manufacturing worker from Cincinnati, not Fostoria, that is a misstatement. I want to clarify that. Good evening—morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Senator DEWINE. Long way from Fostoria to Cincinnati. Not even close, are they?

Mr. BUSH. I am with the Ohio manufacturing company and I would like to just talk about our PEAK program, basically.

In attempting to implement a just-in-time approach to manufacturing and beginning of formal problem solving process—we call them hit teams now within the company—it was discovered by Hollaender that a lot of the employees of the company did not have the necessary basic literacy skills to understand and apply the principles involved in these concepts.

The company enlisted the help of the Great Oaks Vocational School System to aid them in their attempt to determine how to best address the program. Great Oaks suggested a literacy assessment of every employee in the company.

In doing this, the areas of weakness were identified; and our in-house learning center was established that would identify—pardon me. That would identify—I am loss here for a second. Let me start back over again.

The company enlisted the help of the Great Oaks Vocational School System to aid them in their attempt to determine how to best address the program. Great Oaks suggested a literacy assessment of every employee in the company.

In doing this, the areas of weakness were identified; and our in-house learning center was established that would allow each participate to work on their own level in whatever area they needed or wished to improve.

This was done on company time and on company premises for two hours each Monday. The program is still in place today.

I enrolled, personally, in the learning program to refresh my math skills since I had not used them since high school. My job required the use of fractions and decimals and this course served its purpose for me and I employed the skills immediately in the day-to-day aspects of my job.

In preparing this document, I talked with several other PEAK program participants and present are—and here are some of their comments for consideration.

A. My overall skills have advanced to the point where I feel comfortable participating in the problem-solving groups.

I talked to, basically, three ladies, young ladies, who were in this group with me. They are in their mid to late 40's. These comments here are basically from them. I told them I would read these for the panel because, basically, I just went in to refresh my math skills, but it covers a wide variety of ranges of how people feel and the benefits they are getting out of it.

B. It helped me to get readjusted to a learning mode that I had not experienced since attending school.

One lady said: It helped me to learn for myself and also for her grandkids.

The learning program helps me feel better about myself and boosts my self-esteem.

The fact that the company is willing to do this makes me feel part of the company and that the company cares about my development as an individual.

The PEAK program helped me adjust and feel more comfortable in the other programs and changing culture.

In summary, I believe the PEAK program is one of the best developmental tools the company could use. If you expect the company to grow and people to become more involved in the company, outside their normal tasks, you must equip them with the proper tools.

I believe one of the reasons I was asked to come here today is because our company won the Governor's excellence award for this particular program.

I personally believe in the program. I think it is great, and I think every company in America should have a similar program to it because the problem is, when you get into the workforce—and most people are in their 30's and 40's and all baby boomers just

about—you haven't been to school for awhile and the basic things you may not use every day, they get away from you.

The PEAK program and programs like this is a way for a person to be able to sit down, study, maybe get a GED, maybe just apply some knowledge, or just like myself who may just need to refresh some math I hadn't used in years.

It is great because it does make you feel like you are part of a company. We have a small organization and it is kind of close knit, but the great thing about it is we have a caring CEO that really is trying to do the best for his people.

In return, I believe he will get dividends back for that. I think everything will come around full circle for that.

Basically, the only thing I can say about the private sector getting involved in it is that they have to, we have to get involved in it.

The majority of us in this room are in our 30's and 40's and 50. We know the world has changed quite a bit, and the group of young people that young lady was talking about, they are out there, they are out there, and it is at-risk for adults too because the technology is changing and people need an opportunity to better themselves. And any time you can get an educational program that will help them do that, I give it the "thumbs up".

Senator DEWINE. Let me ask you just a couple of questions, Mr. Bush. How long have you worked at Hollaender?

Mr. BUSH. Seven years.

Senator DEWINE. Seven years. Who made the decision for you to go into this program, as far as your math skills?

Mr. BUSH. I did.

Senator DEWINE. Is that something you brought up and said: I need some help, and it was directly job related, you were needing to use fractions and decimals?

Mr. BUSH. Right; that is the one good thing about the program. You make your own mind up. It is not mandatory that you go. We wrestled with that in the inception of the program, but you never learn if you are forced to do anything. This program is good because it doesn't force you.

Senator DEWINE. How big of a company is Hollaender?

Mr. BUSH. I imagine we have about a hundred employees.

Senator DEWINE. The program you talked about, how long has that program been in effect?

Mr. BUSH. It is going on 2 years, not quite 2 years.

Senator DEWINE. And employers were involved somewhat in the development of the program?

Mr. BUSH. Yes. We have certain committees and teams that—we just get together and discuss certain things. This was brought up in one of the committees, and it was tried out, and it kind of moved slow for a minute; and then when we incorporated Great Oaks in, everything started moving pretty well. It kind of got off to a slow start.

People are really kind of afraid to really come in there and say: Hey, I need math, I need English, I don't have a high school diploma. People are kind of afraid of that. So, that is why the pressure is off of putting people into it. Once they saw other people in

it, they started going into it. I think this is probably the best month we have had since its inception.

Senator DEWINE. Do you have any idea what percentage of the people who are employed there are actually involved in some way with this program?

Mr. BUSH. I couldn't give you a percentage, but just off the top of my head, we have, on the shop floor, in my department, manufacturing, probably 50 people, and out of that 50, maybe about, at present, maybe about ten.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. Mr. Berry, good morning.

Mr. BERRY. Good morning, Senator. Senator, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today about my views on the private sector's role in job training. I believe my comments will reinforce some of the early comments made this morning, but may differ in some respects that we will talk about later.

Let me begin by saying I am very encouraged by the Senate Labor and Human Resource Committee's efforts to streamline publicly funded programs and training programs and make them more accessible to both jobseekers and employees. I hope my remarks will help you in your consideration of these important issues.

I am currently on loan from the George Gund Foundation in Cleveland, Ohio, to the Economic Growth Strategy Group, a collaborative project of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association, 15,000 members in Cleveland and Cleveland Tomorrow, an association of chief executive officers of the 57 largest corporations in Cleveland, Ohio, and our two local major affiliates, The Cleveland Foundation, and The George Gund Foundation.

The first project of the Economic Growth Strategy Group is the Jobs and Workforce Initiative, which grows out of the need to elevate job access and workforce preparation to a higher priority on Greater Cleveland's agenda.

The initiative response to the paradox that we, like many other communities, are confronting in Cleveland where large numbers of people are under-employed or unemployed, but yet many area firms are having difficulty finding workers.

Although we are still in the early stages, we have identified four workforce-related issues that we will address through the Initiative.

First, access for job-ready individuals. By this, we mean linking qualified workers who do not know about or cannot find jobs with available jobs in their neighborhood and region.

Second, we will focus on a basic skills agenda. This is our area's current and prospective workforce which has basic skill deficiencies that need to be addressed.

Third, we would look at specialized skill needs. Many manufacturers, some trades, and some of our service companies are currently faced with shortages of workers with certain technical skills that are impeding the productivity and growth potential of their area of industry.

Finally, we will look at the linkages between workforce preparation and economic growth. It is our belief that the lack of a skilled workforce in certain highly technical areas may limit our potential for economic growth.

We are approaching the issue of workforce preparation with a clear bias that the system should be demand-driven or based on employer and labor market needs.

From this perspective, we believe that the private sector role is essential to efforts to shape and direct the national job training system.

While private industry councils exist with input from the private sector, we have yet to learn how to find and demand a way that is positive to local employer needs.

More flexibility at the State and local levels to define how the system should operate will certainly provide more opportunities for input from the private sector.

I also believe that the Federal government has a strong role in supporting private sector involvement by providing useful and timely labor market information, offering incentives for employers to make education and training opportunities available to their employees, and by preserving successful aspects of existing job training programs.

Historically, publicly supported workforce training programs have been seen more as answers to social problems than as methods to address the labor needs of local business and industry.

Federal and State legislators have increasingly targeted resources on specific groups—high school dropouts, welfare recipients, the economically disadvantaged, ex-offenders, and so forth—thereby creating a categorical system of programs supported by narrowly focused advocacy and training groups.

This inhibits our ability to think more broadly about community workforce needs. While each program has attempted to develop ties to employers, the result is essentially a supply-driven system, based on the client's needs, but not necessarily linked to the real world or marketplace. I believe we need to find a better balance between supply and demand.

Private sector involvement in the development of education, training and placement activities is important because the private sector supplies most of the jobs. We suggest that employers with jobs should have a major role in defining and shaping the labor force services of outreach, assessment, training, and referral for both current and future job opportunities.

In fact, we have learned that the most successful job training programs already have these characteristics.

Through the Initiative, we are approaching the challenge of organizing demand for labor in three ways: By geography, by industrial sector, and by industry cluster.

First, by geography. In Cleveland, we have two programs that currently use the private sector in a marketplace-driven system on a geographic basis that are proving to be somewhat successful. We are investigating the possibilities of replicating them more broadly. These programs link residents with jobs that are available in local firms through the screening and placement done by community-based intermediaries that matches the worker's skills with job needs.

These are the Midtown Corridor, Inc. and its partner, Vocational Guidance Services on the east side of Cleveland, and the Westside

Industrial Retention Network on the west side. In both of these job match programs, employers drive the program.

I would hope that the proposed Federal and State reforms allow for the support and expansion of this kind of effort in building opportunities for State employment service agencies to work collaboratively with nonprofit community organizations.

Second, by industrial sectors. We are in the very early stages of examining the potential of organizing small firms in consortia that will consolidate the demand for specialized skills training and thereby shape and drive the community training agenda.

This approach has been used extensively in Europe and may have applicability here in the United States.

In Cleveland, we will work with the Council of Smaller Enterprises and 12,000 member Small Business Association of the Growth Association to look at the potential for packaging demand for training and offering it as a group benefit as has been done with health care insurance and workers compensation. In this respect, COSE could play a brokerage role between firms and training organizations.

Third, by industrial cluster. We are exploring the possibility of encouraging larger firms that have their own training capacity to work with small suppliers around common workforce training needs.

An example of this approach has been developed by the Diebold Corporation in Canton, Ohio. The firm developed a training center at Stark Technical College that it opened up to the firms who supply it. We will be looking for ways to encourage these types of linkages among other firms in the region.

We believe there is a window of opportunity to open the labor market to the economically disadvantaged population. By improving the employment prospects of this group, the community can ease these individuals' dependence on Federal and State assistance.

However, the seamless system should not just encompass training and education for those out of work. It must also make these opportunities available for current workers. The movement of current workers into jobs with higher skill requirements opens the door for entry-level positions for the economic disadvantaged and high school graduates.

Without an integrated approach to workforce preparation, many private sector employers, especially small businesses, will not use the system. Few businesses with job openings have the time to sort through the maze of current services. Their participation in the system must be made relatively easy.

To promote private sector involvement, decision-making should be pushed down to the local level—very similar to what private firms have had to do in the past 15 years to be competitive.

However, the Federal and State governments should still maintain accountability by building communication systems, and developing performance standards that permit autonomy at the local level while guaranteeing overall efficiency, equity, and consistent quality.

Obviously, the private sector does not operate on the basis of political boundaries. Its regions can vary widely: Geographically, by

industry sector, or by supplier network. To involve the private sector, the system must have the flexibility to encompass these varying regional boundaries.

The State system that you authorize should allow for this flexibility which will enable local communities to tap their varying resources to build a workforce development system to meet their unique needs.

Besides allowing flexibility for States and localities to design the most effective program for their circumstances, I suggest several other steps that the Federal Government might consider.

First, the Federal Government may wish to make one-time investments to create vehicles to promote the ongoing participation of the employers in workforce development.

Although the proposed legislation permits states to work with private industry councils or Chambers of Commerce, many communities will need further help on developing the capacity in this area.

Second, the Federal Government, working with States and through regions within the States, should consider creating the capacity to provide more useful and timely labor market information and training to help State and local entities to use that data.

Currently, labor market information is not distributed to or used by State and local level service providers to meet the needs of both jobseekers and employers. The One-Stop shops are good steps in this direction from the jobseeker's perspective, but similar attention needs to be given to the employer side of the equation.

The Federal Government could assist by setting standards, providing technical assistance to states in the marketplace.

Third, the Federal Government should work with states to encourage states to work with businesses, especially the small and medium-sized, to provide education and training opportunities and to pool resources according to geographic areas, and industry cluster, or supply network. Large firms can also be encouraged to provide training to their supplier networks.

Finally, the Federal reform effort should not "throw out the baby with the bath water". While the effort should eliminate inefficient programs, it should not get rid of its existing positive elements just because they are part of the old system or were developed in a different political environment.

The committee should closely examine the programs that do work and ensure that States and localities have flexibility to keep them in place and improve upon them, if they so choose. We do know much about what works.

The Department of Labor recently released a study documenting the accumulated knowledge about successes and failures of various job training programs; and I can talk a bit more about that in the question period, if you wish.

I would like to point out that this Department of Labor report documented those that have not worked and those that have worked; and I hope that in the next iteration of legislation we will learn from the past.

One of the programs that I would call to your attention that seemed to have had outstanding success in linking the disadvantaged into the labor force is the Center for Employment Training

in San Jose, California. Like many other successful job training programs, it relies on companies' advice about what kind of skills to train for and what kind of training equipment to buy.

It was particularly cited by the Department of Labor study as an exception to the general observation that short-term training programs do not work.

The Federal government could spend some of its resources to develop meaningful performance standards and regular program evaluations that use consistent methodologies and help disseminate the effective models, like CET, in other states.

This would provide both states and localities with useful information about how effective their systems are, and allow them to improve their programs and services continually.

In conclusion, I support the efforts to reform the existing workforce development system and urge your careful consideration of the private sector role in this effort.

Senator DEWINE. Mr. Berry, thank you. Let me ask you a couple of questions before you move on. You State as follows:

In Cleveland, we may work with the Council of Smaller Enterprises to package demands for training and offer it as a group benefit as has been done with health care insurance and workers compensation.

Explain in a little more detail how this would work for an employer or employees.

Mr. BERRY. You asked me the question that we are in the process of trying to answer. We are in the very earliest stages of working this through. The assumption underlined with that comment is that many small companies, by themselves, do not have the capacity to mount their own training efforts.

If we could consolidate the demands of a number of small companies who have similar skill needs in a package, then COSE might be able to broker an arrangement with a local training provider to provide that training service at a, on an affordable basis. That is the general intent there, but we are in the very early stages.

Senator DEWINE. Understanding you are in the early stages, but would you anticipate it would be driven by a very specific need, or is this more of a general association, or whatever you want, of COSE, that: We are going to do training in this particular area, and we already have two companies interested in this, and here is a notice, and here is what we are going to do; and if anybody else is interested, this is how we are going to do it?

Mr. BERRY. I would guess we are looking at specialized needs where we package 10 to 15 companies. COSE might have that capacity built into its organization on a permanent basis where it might have a training broker who would identify those opportunities and put together the packaging material.

Senator DEWINE. And you have the advantage of COSE well established and ongoing and successful. How many companies are in COSE?

Mr. BERRY. 12,000.

Senator DEWINE. 12,000. So, you have a very large market pool to draw from.

Mr. BERRY. We will keep you abreast of that.

Senator DEWINE. You made another statement that maybe I would like for you to expand on a little bit, or at least my restating it might reemphasize it. You state: The movement of current workers into jobs with higher skill requirements opens the door to entry-level positions for the economically disadvantaged.

Your point here, I guess, is that if it is an integrated system and we are concerned about all workers, we are also concerned about those who are not working. We are really concerned about those who are not working and we have to make sure the other workers move up and are advancing their skill and productivity?

Mr. BERRY. We have to create opportunities for upward mobility within companies so entry-level positions can be opened up.

Senator DEWINE. Let me turn, if I could, to your final comment where you invite questions. I will take the opportunity now in regards to what works. You told me, when I talked to you several days ago, that you don't pretend to be an expert in this area, but you have spent some time studying the studies and looking into this area. I wonder if you could elaborate on what you have already stated. Let us start with the one program that you have talked about and that was the program——

Mr. BERRY. In San Jose?

Senator DEWINE. In San Jose. What were the characteristics of this program that worked? I have in front of me a Department of Labor study that cites this CET program numerous times. What are the characteristics of this particular program that made it work and we believe increased the results?

Mr. BERRY. The one characteristic that I mention is that it is employer driven. It has—and I don't recall off the top of my head the major center in San Jose, but it has training programs and, I believe, 28 different skill tracks. Each of those skill tracks has an employer advisory committee that helps establish the performance standards for that skill track and identifies the kind of equipment and training that should be used and has turned out to be a major source of hiring for graduates. There is intimate involvement of the employers from the initial conception of the curriculum to hiring.

I visited this program in San Jose and also a replication site in Baltimore, Maryland.

Senator DEWINE. Labor is trying to replicate this at a number of sites; is that correct?

Mr. BERRY. Yes. What impresses me about it is it takes individuals who have very low levels of basic skills, immediately inserts them into a training program around this specific technical skill, and uses that, structures that training process in a way that it is essentially work experience.

People are there eight hours a day being trained. They have to show up on time. They are participating in a group, and the group sanctions them if they are not there on time. So, it builds in these work-ethic characteristics into the work training program.

The notion of building basic skill levels up to acceptable levels is done in the context of learning enough basic skills to do the job they are being trained to do.

Senator DEWINE. So, if I could summarize to make sure I understand: Instead of one approach, which has been used, which is to take an individual who has a substandard educational background

or attainment level and, let's say, trying to get that person a GED or trying to bring them from ninth grade to twelfth grade, what this program does is it is focused directly on the job?

Mr. BERRY. That is correct.

Senator DEWINE. So, if that person needs certain math skills for that job, that program concentrates on those math skills.

That particular individual may not know American history, but we don't worry about that with regard to that program. You focus on what is related to that job.

Now, I assume one of the advantages is that if students can relate to that and see the benefit, the instant benefit of being able to do that job; if you want to do that job, I have the skill, so that is a direct connection.

Mr. BERRY. That is correct, and there is a lot of emphasis on self-esteem. Perhaps that is incentive in itself. In this training program, self-esteem building, which is necessary, is a by-product of achievement-related learning skills.

Senator DEWINE. Again, in terms of upside down, the way it is done sometimes, the building of self-esteem and then the skills which leads to the skills and self-esteem.

Mr. BERRY. That is the approach of this program.

Senator DEWINE. One of the other aspects of this particular program that I noticed was its linkage directly into the local communities. We are going to hear later on from the head of the job force site, and we will be asking him about this when he testifies; but one of the things that I have been—that struck me as being interesting, at least about Job Corps, is that Job Corps draws from several areas. Job Corps in Dayton may have people from Chicago. They go back to Chicago. They may stay in that area, but they may go back to Chicago.

I will ask you to comment on this, and I will ask him to comment later on; but it seems to me that maybe one of the lessons of this CET project in San Jose—one of the lessons there may be how important it is to integrate that job training directly with a specific job, and to also make sure that the people at the training program have connections directly into the relevant job market in that community.

It seems to me that might be something we are losing if we have a young man or young woman from Chicago who is in Dayton and then maybe will go back. I will ask you to comment on that.

Mr. BERRY. I would agree with that observation in general. The approach we are taking on these issues is to attempt to max out what we can do within our own geography with the ties between the employers and the training institutions.

With the types of individuals the Job Corps is dealing with, however, these are folks who may need intensive work; and it may make sense to look at the economy scale when organizing this.

Senator DEWINE. There would be a counter-argument to that?

Mr. BERRY. Yes.

Senator DEWINE. Mr. Robinson, good morning.

Mr. ROBINSON. Good morning. Thank you, Senator DeWine. It is a privilege to be here.

My name is Burr Robinson. I am Executive Director of Jobs Plus Employment Network where I have been for about a year and a

half after a 31-year career at Proctor and Gamble. I left because I was involved with a number of agencies in community service work and felt that I could contribute there on a second career basis.

Despite the huge investment of public and private dollars directed at training and employment of the chronically unemployed, Cincinnati's inner city communities, like most other inner city communities, continue to have very high unemployment. O-T-R is Cincinnati's number one poverty community. Of its approximately 9,000 residents, about 6,000 are public assistance recipients. Unemployment is estimated to be 25 percent. Many job training programs target this population.

Most of these programs are generally structured to address what I refer to as external factors, such as developing job skills, learning how to apply for jobs, how to dress, how to interview, and so forth.

These programs do not generally address the internal factors which are often the primary barriers to achieving sustained employment, such as work ethic, self-esteem, destructive attitudes leading to addictive behavior. Thus, the root cause of unemployment is not addressed, resulting in long-term joblessness.

Long-term unemployment among low income populations has two major consequences. First, the individual becomes dependent on public/private assistance, which does not provide sufficient income to break poverty cycles; and 2) the individual often develops a low sense of self-worth which, when combined with significant idle time, draws them into unhealthy lifestyles involving such things as drugs, alcohol, theft, prostitution, and other behaviors.

Breaking this cycle requires two essential forces to come together. First is the development of positive attitudes needed to motivate individuals to address job readiness factors, such as work ethic, drug abstinence, marital issues, and so forth.

The second is a job opportunity providing sufficient income to allow the person to be independent of the public assistance support system.

Jobs Plus Employment Network has been established to marshal existing resources to meet these needs. At Jobs Plus, we focus on four guiding principles in the training and support of our job clients.

First, a collaborative of churches and local service agencies provides a holistic program of support addressing physical, emotional, and spiritual needs relating to finding and holding employment.

Second, training focusing on developing the necessary attitudes and work ethnic required to achieve productive long-term employment.

Third, job skill training is provided primarily by employers supplemented by schools and existing training programs.

Fourth, ongoing client support addresses employment issues and goals during early months of employment.

Jobs Plus Employment Network was founded in late 1994 as a privately funded, nonprofit corporation. Jobs Plus establishes a 90-day relationship with job candidates, all of whom are referred by churches in the community.

During this time, the candidate receives pre-employment counseling and training related to job attitudes and work ethic and support in sustaining and upgrading employment.

At Jobs Plus, the objective of the pre-employment training is to increase, the candidate's understanding of the values and attitudes critical for success in the workplace. We talk about the value and purpose of work, how the customer should drive the relationship between the employer and employee, the importance of continuously learning and growing in a job, and character attributes like honesty and obedience that are critical in the workplace. The basis for all of this teaching is Judeo-Christian principles taught in the Bible.

In the first 6 months of operation, we have had 62 people employed with an average wage of $6.25. About 75 percent of our clients are male, and 83 percent are African-American, and 33 percent have a felony record, and 37 receive public assistance.

While it is too early to measure retention rate, 78 percent of our clients are still employed. We see a great deal of evidence of positive changes in lifestyles. Of our first 36 employed candidates, six began regular church attendance, three started child support, eight opened bank accounts, twelve were off the homeless rolls, three went off ADC assistance, and three marriages were reconciled.

Jobs Plus operates with a three person staff and a $90,000 budget. Funds are contributed by employers, individuals, churches, and private foundations. Our cost per client placed into employment is $600.

Given the amount of time required to support our client base, we believe that we can realistically place about 150 people into employment annually at current staffing levels.

Turning to the three questions this panel is being asked to focus on, our experience at Jobs Plus indicates the following.

Question 1 is: Is it important for the private sector to be involved in job training?

It is very important for the private sector to be involved in job training. We believe that employers should have the primary responsibility for job skill training, and speakers here have spoken to that fairly well.

Almost every employer we are working with says the same thing: Give me a worker who will show up on time every day with a desire to provide an honest day's work, and we will figure out how to train them.

This has the critical advantage of ensuring that training will result in a job at the end of the training period.

Some job skills like secretarial and nursing do require formal training. Private schools provide the best means of teaching these skills. Local markets can dictate the type of schools needed to match employer demands. Students should always be required to pay at least part of the cost to ensure that they have an investment in the training.

Question two: What can be done to promote private sector involvement?

The government should create incentives which encourage the private sector to establish community-based training programs through private schools. The private sector will meet the need for

training if there are incentives for a reasonable return on their investment.

One important way the private sector can encourage the private sector development of productive training is through loan guarantee programs for tuition payments. However, such programs must require some upfront investment by those being trained and avoid the problems associated with existing college tuition guarantee programs.

Three: What is the role of the Federal Government in this area?

There are several areas where the Federal Government can assume a major role:

First and foremost is to eliminate the opportunity for the able-bodied citizens to remain on public assistance rather than work. Public assistance for able-bodied should be for short-term emergency assistance only.

At Jobs Plus, we are seeing a marked increase in the number of people seeking employment because they have heard that their welfare payments may end. Imagine what will happen if these payments actually do end?

Second, some of the huge reductions in job training and welfare budgets should be applied to improvement in public transit. Better ways need to be found to make it possible for people who want to work to get to work.

Third, ways need to be found to provide medical insurance for all workers. However, unlike existing programs, new approaches must be created that provide incentives for those insured to control the costs such as medical IRAs.

Research was recently conducted in Cincinnati which showed that there are 10,000 entry-level jobs available with a starting wage of at least $6 an hour, and half of them have a starting wage of $8 an hour or more.

Further there are 20,000 unemployed able-bodied men and women in the Greater Cincinnati community capable of productive work. Nonetheless, employers cannot fill these jobs because willing workers cannot be found.

At Jobs Plus, we believe these jobs can be filled and lives changed for the better if principles applied in the Jobs Plus program are reapplied broadly and if public policy is directed to creating incentives that promote work and encourage the private sector to provide needed training. Thank you.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. How do people know about Jobs Plus?

Mr. ROBINSON. We have about 35 community organizations in the inner city community in Cincinnati, and we have simply gone out and talked to them.

These are drug rehabilitation programs, in some cases incarceration or postincarceration programs, community-based agencies. We go out and talk to them and explain to them what our goals and objectives are.

Senator DEWINE. What is your involvement with churches in the communities?

Mr. ROBINSON. Churches, we will treat churches similar to an agency and go to them and say: Do you have individuals in this church who need employment? We would ask you to support them

and their lifestyle needs; all right? Maybe they need to continue with a GED program or drug rehab or an AA type of program. Hold them accountable to that.

Send them to Jobs Plus, and we will put them through this training I spoke of; and we will set objectives and goals for them, not only that include the ones you are holding them accountable for, but what we want to hold them accountable for seeking and holding employment; and we will hold a relationship with them for 90 days as they move in the workplace so we are in constant communication with the churches or agency.

Senator DEWINE. In regard to churches, what has been your success or lack of success in getting churches involved?

Mr. ROBINSON. The larger churches who have permanent staff—in inner cities many churches have pastors who are part-time. It is much more difficult for them to be involved with us.

But, with three of the Catholic churches, with staffing, full-time staffing and probably a half dozen Protestant churches we have, we are probably placing about one third of our candidates through churches. We are receiving one third of our candidates through them.

Senator DEWINE. One third of your intake comes from references from churches?

Mr. ROBINSON. Right. The most active churches are those where they have really developed a commitment to employment and to dealing with the whole person, net just the spiritual, but the other needs.

Senator DEWINE. Could you expand a little bit about what Jobs Plus does in regard to follow up? You mentioned that, but can you give me more detail? Once someone gets a job, what is your role then?

Mr. ROBINSON. We require each candidate to go through the readiness training, and then they come in the next day or two and do a job action plan.

That job action plan spells out where they are going to seek employment. We give them one or two places. We have relationships with a lot of employers, and we will send them to the appropriate places.

At that point, we will sign this action plan, and they sign it, and we will send a copy to the church or agency that referred them. It will include, as we mentioned, those things they agreed to do with that church or agency.

Then, after they begin to seek employment or once they are employed, they will join a Job Plus club that meets on Monday nights at 5:30. It is a support group or club they run. They elect a president; but we provide some teaching at the beginning of that meeting related to character traits that are important in the workplace like truthfulness, orderliness, that type of thing.

We do that for 20 minutes or so, and then we will have a discussion about what is happening with them in the workplace: The joys, sorrows, and we will talk about that as a group. That provides us with an ongoing way to understand how they are doing.

We may call the employer and find out from them how they are doing. We want to help them overcome the challenges that they are facing and counsel them, if you will, in doing that.

Senator DEWINE. Let me turn to the entire panel and just see if, as we conclude with this panel, if any of the witnesses want to comment on anything that has been said so far this morning that they haven't had a chance to comment on? Anybody want to react to anybody else?

Mr. HANIGAN. Thank you, Senator. The one thing that I have heard from Mr. Robinson and even Mr. Berry is a statement concerning training as far as it relates to skills and identifying skills.

Under a previous administration, there was a report issued called Secretary's Commission On Achieving Necessary Skills. It started with Elizabeth Dole and ended with Lynn Martin, and identified certain foundations and competencies.

A lot of these go to the heart of what Mr. Robinson was saying. Those certain items, self-esteem, integrity, being able to show up for work, I think all too often, when administrations change, they close the door on a lot of work that was done by the previous administration and a lot of good thought is left behind.

In saying that, I would advise or request that the committee take another look at those with regards to the foundation upon which skill based training might be developed, and from that leading into perhaps skills themselves.

I earlier alluded to a skill-based program under information, labor market information. If, on the intake side, you have applicants being profiled and interviewed and those specific skills are clearly being identified, move away from the archaic dictionary title.

Employers achieving or wanting to find skilled applicants, placing their job orders using similar common language and definitions, and in putting into that same labor market information system, possibly run by the employment system, their job openings using similar skills, what you have developed Matrix and as that information is being developed, the qualities of the referral is improved, but more important from the training side, what you will find are specific skills that all employers are asking for, specifically skills that perhaps are isolated out; and that precious resource should not be wasted and are best served by the employers themselves.

That information is actually or should be perhaps the driving force behind a lot of training programs.

Senator DEWINE. Anyone else?

Mr. ROBINSON. I was really encouraged by what Hollaender Manufacturing has done and the commitment they have made to the basic skill training for their employees. I don't know how to get the word out, the motivation there.

Clearly, they have management staff that encourages this. We see so many individuals coming to us; and if they could integrate eduation-type skill enhancement in the workplace, and see how it directly relates to their work, their motivation soars. And I think, Ron, you referred to the comradery that develops among the workforce and loyalty because employers have such high turnover at the entry level that, if we breaded this system through temporary employment services where day-to-day—you know, the kind of thing you are doing works in the other direction and I think that is marvelous.

They are in Cincinnati and not Fostoria, and I am delighted because I will be over there pretty soon.

Senator DEWINE. Mr. Robinson, let me ask you: You spent a long career at Proctor and Gamble.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Senator DEWINE. Then you moved into this, what I would describe as a lean, mean, operation where there is less than a $100,000 budget and very small, really. Focused over the Rhine area, your office is right there. What one thing surprised you the most after having done that now for a few months?

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, one thing that impressed me in the contrast between being very local based is, first of all, every dollar counts. We have to stretch our dollars as effectively as possible or we can't—we need to think about that in terms of providing a product to the marketplace.

Our product is a willing worker, if you will, with an attitude that comes in and says: I will show up on time. If we can satisfy employers with that, there is an economic benefit there. I think we can even get a privately funded, nonprofit organization if we think in market terms of about what we are doing and we are directed more toward providing an output of economic value.

We need to educate ourselves more on this and to formalize that a bit more and also with employers, because employers look at our kind of agency a little skeptically. Here they come again.

So, I think the linkages need to be in terms of market driven; and much of what we talked about here is that, and to get over the skepticism. I think we can do that. I think we can do that. That is just one thought in that regard.

Senator DEWINE. Again, one of the most pretentious issues to be resolved in current Federal legislation is the funding formula. Current programs are allocated on factors such as State population, poverty, unemployment rates.

You mentioned an additional factor, I think, for consideration. You talked about industry sectors. What do you mean by that, and do you have a specific recommendation about how we can get data on this?

Mr. HANIGAN. My reference deals with a lot of states that have a growing industry base, and you notice their employment rates dropping precipitously. You have other states receiving large grants or a large funding stream for training, yet their employment base is very low.

It raises serious question concerning what type of training is, in fact, going on in those states; and out of those individuals, are they gaining gainful employment at the end of the training?

At times, we are a very mobile society. I realize a lot of unemployed people do not like to move location. However, just recently we had to reach into Massachusetts to find a service manager simply because we could not find one in or around the Cleveland area.

So, the whole idea of reaching out and moving people, I think, is very important. In those states that are, in fact, the engine, driving the economy should not be encumbered because they don't have the revenue stream to support the industry that is growing.

As far as the specific recommendation, no, I do not, other than there are, there is information through the Department of Labor,

Bureau of Labor and Statistics in regards to new jobs and current positions, current employment. Perhaps that is a place to start and take a look at where those jobs are.

Senator DEWINE. You talked a lot about making information available, and that is obviously very, very important. Do you have any idea what percentage of employers in Ohio currently publish their job openings with the employment service?

Mr. HANIGAN. No, I do not. I do know that the administration, I believe, from OBES will be here to testify.

Senator DEWINE. What is your guess?

Mr. HANIGAN. Probably around 30 percent. That is just my gut feeling. The reason it is low is it has been managed over the years with different types of Federal training programs—not Federal training programs, but Federal programs where they are looked upon as another source of work, for workers of all classifications, but, basically, only lower-skilled workers, and that is not necessarily the case.

I think employers, as they get into the system, discover that there are more positions made available or workers made available through the system than at the lower-skilled level; and as more employers get involved in that with more systems, more openings go into it and more applicants apply to it. More applicants apply, more employers list. So we need to rejuvenate that particular area.

Senator DEWINE. Let me ask you one final question. Do you think that employers would support using wage records that are currently available through the employment system to track the long-term placement and performance of participation in the job training program? Getting good data is very, very difficult.

Mr. HANIGAN. I think you would have problems with confidentiality; and certain employers would, perhaps, be concerned about their wage information being public. But, as long as confidentiality is retained, I would not, as an employer, have any problem having that information used in that fashion.

Senator DEWINE. Any other comments from any of our members of the panel? Mr. Berry?

Mr. BERRY. I had a comment/question that I can really follow up with Mr. Hanigan in Cleveland. It seemed to me we said something that may have sounded different to those in attendance here. I think it may be more of a technical issue.

I think Mr. Hanigan said that the issue of helping jobseekers should be separate from the training for the existing workforce; and I think that was from a funding stream perspective and ought not to be mixed with the unemployment compensation stream, ought not to be tapped for that purpose.

Mr. HANIGAN. Thank you. What I look toward is an idealistic agency, a duly-funded stream, a dual system that is interconnected. It is very important for employers to have a list of unemployed workers.

I would love to say industry only hires people, but we have down cycles. When we are forced into a down cycle, workers are laid off and go into unemployment, that is, a permanent layoff.

It behooves us to have those job-ready applicants—I am talking specifically about job-ready, immediately severed and put in an-

other job. It helps economy, helps government, and the employer as well as the worker.

If they are on unemployment long, the unemployment ratings go up. I alluded to the profile system and the labor market system that is the conduit between the job-ready side and the training side. I am concerned that when you receive moneys for training as a business, they are driven by the fact that the only way you get more money is to place those trained.

So, the only way you merge both functions under one umbrella and have one entity at this time overseeing both the driving engine is no longer placing job-ready, but placing trainees.

Senator DEWINE. Well, we want to thank all of you: Mr. Hanigan, Mr. Bush, Mr. Berry, and Mr. Robinson, I know your testimony was very helpful and good and we appreciate your time very much.

I would ask the second panel to come up. We will take a 5-minute break. Thank you. [Recess.]

The next panel will deal with the role of the hard-to-serve populations. Let me start on my right. Gabriella Hernandez, JTPA student of the year for Ohio.

The next person, going from my right to left, is Doug Aydelott, Dayton Job Corps.

Sandra Green, Partnership Ohio.

Miss Lisa Corbett, Centers For Independent Living, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Ninia Downs, Ohio Restaurant Association.

Let's start with Gabriella Hernandez. Good morning.

**STATEMENT OF GABRIELLA HERNANDEZ, JTPA STUDENT OF THE YEAR FOR OHIO; DOUG AYDELOTT, CENTER DIRECTOR, DAYTON JOB CORPS; SANDRA GREEN, PARTNERSHIP OHIO; LISA CORBETT, CENTERS FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING, CINCINNATI, OHIO; AND NINIA DOWNS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS, OHIO RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION, AND PROGRAM DIRECTOR, LADDERS FOR SUCCESS**

Ms. HERNANDEZ. Good morning. Very nice to meet you.

I married at the age of 14———

Senator DEWINE. Maybe you could hold the mike closer.

Ms. HERNANDEZ. I married at the age of 14, moved from Texas, and relocated to Darke County, Ohio, with my husband and his family, my husband's family having come to Ohio 3 years before I came. We all worked in a seasonal migrant farm harvesting tomatoes.

I enrolled in high school in September and started my freshman year. The next year my brother had left my parents' home at the age of 12 and came to Texas to live with me.

In August of 1988, Angie, my daughter, was born, and I was not allowed to go back to school until October.

That year I was named to the honor roll for the first time in my life. My brother, Joseph, was also doing well, receiving awards for his good work.

As a senior, I decide I wanted to further my education, although my family said I was a female and did not need to educate myself any further. Despite family advice, I asked my guidance counselor

how I could get financial assistance to attend college. I was referred to JTPA.

Prior to my graduating, my sister, Matilda, left home at age 16 and also came to live with me.

JTPA staff told me of the financial assistance they could offer me to attend college through the Title IIC youth program, as well as the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program.

The opportunities afforded through JTPA kept my family and myself from returning to the tomato fields. When we joined this program, the rest of my family did continue to go into the fields, my husband's family and their brothers and sisters.

Family members, Joe and Matilda, received training through the Summer Program and I received assessment and assistance to enroll in college. JTPA also arranged for transportation.

All three of us could perceive success in our future with the assistance of JTPA and our own determination to succeed.

With the first paycheck Joe and Matilda received and the money I had saved from a program that paid me to stay in high school, we bought a $500 car.

Our next goal was to get a driver's license so we could drive our car. By the end of Summer, Joe and myself had gotten our driver's licenses.

In the Summer of 1990, we had moved out of the camp. Metropolitan housing had called, and we all had a bedroom—even my two-year-old daughter. I had now accomplished my goal of being the first in my family to graduate from high school.

In the fall of 1990, Joe and Matilda went back to high school; and I started college. The JTPA was not only helping with tuition assistance, but also transportation and child care. We were receiving other assistance such as food stamps, general assistance, medical card, and HEAP, just to get by.

My brother, Joe, had graduated in 1991; and JTPA encouraged him to further his education and started preparing him to enter college.

Meanwhile, we all three joined the summer Youth Employment Training Program. We completely went off public assistance that summer, still surviving, and looking forward to the day we could all be off public assistance permanently.

In September of 1991, Joe and I attended college together; and Matilda returned to high school. The next summer came and Joe and I enrolled in the summer Youth Program with enthusiasm.

Matilda moved to Michigan and was soon to be a teenage mother. I attended college part time while working full-time during the summer program.

On July 26th, my brother, Joe, was killed near our home in a traffic car accident. He fell asleep at the wheel on his way from work.

Determined to complete my education, I returned to school in the fall, only to find the memories of my brother unbearable.

After much encouragement from my JTPA case manager, I continued only to fail the quarter. I was then suspended from school for one quarter. While suspended, I obtained a seasonal clerical job at H & R Block.

After more encouragement from JTPA staff, I agreed to return to college. The classes I needed to complete were filled, so I took a Word Perfect class at the JTPA office and worked part time.

Due to complications with my second pregnancy, I was advised to stay in bed for the following 3 months. Still determined to complete my office administration degree, I returned to school full time in the fall of 1993, after the birth of my second daughter.

In March of 1994, I also began working through a temporary service at American Matsushita in Troy, Ohio, still attending classes full-time.

On May 7, 1994, I successfully completed my degree program at Edison State, graduated; and I was offered a full-time permanent position as quality assurance clerk at Panasonic.

I would like to add that I was the first of my family to graduate from college.

Without the assistance of JTPA, I would never have fulfilled my life's dream. Any time a problem occurred, they were available to assist me. Without their ongoing encouragement through so many of the tribulations in my life, I easily could have given up and stopped attending school and proceeded back into my old life.

I owe my success to JTPA. They offered everything an individual needs to accomplish a goal, whether it be job training or completing your education. JTPA came to me when I needed them and offered me essential services to succeed.

I received a Pell Grant, but the checks were never issued until you had two or 3 weeks left to complete the quarter.

The individual one-on-one assistance from the staff is what I attribute most to my success. JTPA staff gave me encouragement and a positive look toward my future from day one. They assisted me if I had trouble with my homework; they offered me use of the computer lab; they helped with my daughter's child care; and immediately offered transportation when my car broke down.

I received training from the summer program in education from the IIC youth program; and when I just needed advice, they were there, too.

I am truly proud to be off the welfare system and be a tax-paying citizen. Thanks to all who made my dreams come true and by giving me the skills necessary to succeed.

My sister, Matilda, moved back to Texas with her two children. With the assistance of JTPA IIC youth funding, she completed RN training this spring and is waiting to take the State Boards.

I have two sisters-in-law, and they also went through the youth program, and they also are employed now. Both of them joined the program for one summer, but that was enough for them to put something down on their resume when they went to look for a job. One of them is an assistant manager at a K-Mart store; and her other sister, she also works there, too, and she has been promoted higher up to the customer service clerk.

I also have another brother-in-law, and he went through the program 2 years; and he also—through that training, he applied for a job at a company there in Darke County and is doing well. He has been there for 2 years, and he now—just from working on a line, he is higher up also and has been promoted.

So, I know of people and myself who have used the program; and every since the beginning, when I started, when I was a senior, I said I want to go, but I don't have money. I don't have a car. If I can get help, I'll go. When I heard from JTPA, I said, I will do it. If you help me, I will do it, so I did.

Senator DEWINE. Great, congratulations.

Ms. HERNANDEZ. Thank you.

Senator DEWINE. Where did you go to college?

Ms. HERNANDEZ. Edison State Community College.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much.

Mr. AYDELOTT. Senator DeWine, it is certainly a pleasure to be here today and have an opportunity to share a little bit about Job Corps, which is a federally funded program for disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 24.

In answer to the first question: What is currently being done to serve the needs of adverse youth?

Of course, there are such programs as we heard of: JTPA, alternative programs, and Job Corps. These are only a few programs that provide training.

Job Corps is a program that provides, as I see it, the most comprehensive service for job training of that age group, 16 to 24. The mission of this federally funded program is for disadvantaged youth to receive job skills training, education, and social skills needed to join the workforce and become productive citizens.

Job Corps was established in 1964 and was administered by the Department of Labor. During that time, it has served more than 1.6 million at-risk youths; and today serves approximately 63,000 annually.

The average Job Corps student is 18 years old, reads at a seventh grade level, and never has held a full-time job. Many come from disruptive home lives. Forty-three percent of the students' families receive public assistance, and 79 percent of high-school-age youths drop out of high school.

Given those factors, an astonishing 70 percent of the students in the Job Corps program leave the program to get jobs, join the military, or go on to further their education. Those kind of results certainly have a positive impact on our society.

Of course, there has been discussion of whether Job Corps would remain a distinct national program or turn over the program to the states through Block Grants. I feel strongly that Job Corps should be maintained as a Federal program, and I will share a few views that are commonly held in the Job Corps communities.

Job Corps is a comprehensive program and provides residential—and that is a key which I will bring out further—residential training for programs for at-risk youth.

In 1993, 70 percent of participants were placed in jobs for advanced education.

It is cost effective. For $61 a day, Job Corps provides basic education, job training, social skills training, 24-hour safe learning environment, meals, medical care, counseling, leadership training, and job placement services.

In terms of administration, in its current State, Job Corps has, on a Federal level, about 179 individuals either operating through

the Department of Labor's national office or the regional offices of which there are ten, and they provide oversight for this program.

Of course, in my view, it would certainly seem that if it were moved into a State bureaucracy, it would significantly increase the overall cost if it were maintained as a separate program within each state; and there could be, of course, some lagging in services due to the difficult nature of operating residential training programs.

I think one of the strong factors that goes for Job Corps is we have established community and business linkages. Each of the 111 Job Corps campuses are required by the Department of Labor regulations to develop community linkages, to have local support groups, and local participation by business and communities.

This enables the centers to obtain valid feedback on training programs so the center can make appropriate changes to meet the appropriate job market needs.

There is also a national network of placement services which allows Job Corps graduates access to job markets across the country. You could receive training in one section of the country, and actually end up placed and relocated in another section.

Job Corps has an extremely strong accountability system. The system maintains data on students enrolled; and they have to, of course, give accounts to the taxpayers and Congress each year as to the results of those things.

Documentation includes GED attainment. Each center has its standards to meet. Average wage of all graduates, reading and math gains, job training match, and job placement. The performance results of the centers has a direct impact on whether contracts are renewed.

In Job Corps, the majority of the centers are operated by majority contractors; so if a contractor is not doing the job, then those things, those operations, would be pulled from that contractor and awarded to another.

Some possible disadvantages to a State run program could be things such as shifting priority, State budget restraints, and those kinds of issues.

An advantage within the system is Job Corps serves students from any locality. Shifting Job Corps to states could lead to high levels of service in states which have several Job Corps centers—Ohio has three—to low levels of service in others, to no service in such states as Wyoming, which has no Job Corps center.

Not all Job Corps centers offer all trades; and, consequently, considerable funds would have to be expended initially to equip centers to provide a variety of training in each State.

How can we improve these services? I think we, of course, have to expand the opportunities for more youths out there in disadvantaged areas to take advantage of the comprehensive service.

I have 17 years of experience in Job Corps, and I certainly know that one of the—as we say in the business, the heart and soul is the comprehensive residential components. The residential aspect provides the students with a safe haven away from their destructive home environments, and offers them a chance to succeed with little distraction.



91-525 95 - 3

Students learn more about themselves and their abilities from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. on a personal level than you can imagine.

In our center, we teach 52 social skills in the evenings; and those skills help the individuals learn how to take instructions, everything from personal hygiene on. It is a very important aspect of the Job Corps system.

Also, they have to maintain their rooms. They have to keep their rooms clean, make their beds in a certain way, get up, clean the dorms, clean the floors, shine the floors. Those things go on through the entire center, but there is an extra emphasis put on the residential area; and, basically, what happens through that is there is a strong sense of self-esteem and teamwork developed in those dorms; and I think that really helps the individuals to help establish some of the appropriate social skills necessary to make that transition into the world of work.

Job Corps has always made changes to meet the training needs of youth. In Region V a couple of years ago, actually, from my center, we implemented what we call no tolerance, which is a groundwork twist of the new Zero Tolerance. The region implemented that regionwide about a year and a half ago.

Basically, it is a policy that outlaws any violence, gangs, drugs, sexual harassment, and those kinds of issues.

Given that Region V serves a high percentage of inner city youth, I know that for Region V it has been very helpful.

In my center, particularly by taking this strong behavioral approach and not tolerating things that are many times tolerated in other systems, we have been able to create a very safe and secure learning environment.

Today in Job Corps, students must sign a pledge attesting to their personal commitment to remain drug-free. They are tested upon entry, and those who are tested positive have 30 days to get clean. If they don't have a clean drug test within that time, they are terminated.

Anyone with a history of violence or criminal behavior is ineligible to participate in the program, and any student who commits an illegal act is terminated from Job Corps immediately.

This, of course, has created a major change in the direction of student recruitment. As society and the economy change, we, in the Job Corps, have to change also.

The workplace is more demanding than ever, so our challenge is to prepare students even better than before for employment. To do that, we are providing a safer environment in which students can establish careers.

We will not tolerate any violation of our strict rules against violence and drug use.

Students now must demonstrate their commitment right away. They are involved in a 30-day probationary period in which they are evaluated as to whether to remain in the program.

Job Corps will provide those resources only to those students serious about taking advantage of the training available.

In the coming months, Job Corps expects to see its biggest change—a shift from younger to older students. Today, more than 40 percent of students nationwide are 16 or 17 years old. Recruit-

ment will soon focus on students 18-24 who have performed better because of greater maturity and a firmer commitment.

Job Corps recruitment efforts are always changing in anticipation of this or are already changing in anticipation of this major realignment.

Through all of this, the mission of Job Corps has not changed. It is still a program for disadvantaged youth to receive the job skills training, education, and social skills needed to join the workforce. But now, more than ever, these youth must be serious.

Misperception in the past caused some to label Job Corps as a last chance program for youthful offenders. Today, Job Corps' culture should dispel any remaining myths. A Zero Tolerance policy and stringent drug screening ensures a serious Job Corps population.

Staff are spending their time with the students working on career development and not having to spend as much time taking care of the behavior issues. Those are weeded out relatively quickly.

Job Corps will be spending its resources on goal-oriented, nonviolent, drug-free students.

These changes ensure a high-quality experience for our students. Everyone on center will now have just one focus: To produce well-trained, marketable, job prospects.

The third question is: What is the role of the Federal Government in this area?

It is critically important to stress that the Federal Government should have a role in addressing the needs of at-risk youth through Job Corps.

Most of the students enrolled in Job Corps did not succeed in the education and training programs offered by State and local government. Seventy-nine percent are high school dropouts. Job Corps, of course, is a program for at-risk youth and is effective in getting students into jobs or on to higher education.

Certainly, I think we can streamline some systems; and inter-relate some of our systems and I think we were talking about that in the previous panel.

The Federal Government could save taxpayers money by strengthening the relationship between various job training programs, such as JTPA and other organizations which serve youth. If agencies were linked via computer, certainly training needs could be better served and duplication of services reduced. We know that the computer will be a valuable asset to that system.

Another program I think we need to look at is the School To Work Act, which took effect this year and really needs to be evaluated since the Act lays the groundwork for a system of programs that combine work-based learning and connecting activities.

Job Corps, of course, is the unparalleled leader in this School-To-Work training, and has been since 1964. We use a 6 week work experience, which puts the finishing touches on our students.

Vocational training is valuable in terms of the kind of feedback we get from those employers. Are we training the students the right way? Are we training them on the right equipment? And those kinds of things. So, we get good feedback on those kinds of programs.

We use applied academics to our training. Some of our academic courses train students to be a carpenter, some of the academic courses actually use the same vocabulary you use as a carpenter.

By the year 2000, 65 percent of all jobs will require skilled workers. Where will they come from? Under our present system, such workers emerge from technical schools, apprenticeships, on-the-job training, and Job Corps.

Clearly, Job Corps has shown by giving private business a central role, School-To-Work can be expanded successfully. Job Corps constantly seeks industrial advice and input in order to offer relevant and up-to-date training.

Job Corps offers an example of success for other School-To-Work programs to study. The concept behind the School-To-Work Opportunities Act is to integrate various School-To-Work programs into a successful system while preserving their unique ability to serve particular populations.

I really think we have to look very carefully at the private sector and the community's involvement in job training programs. They need to be involved in the operation and in determining what is needed out there in terms of training, what is needed locally, regionally, nationally, to meet the economic needs.

Job Corps centers are certainly dependent on Community Relations Councils and Vocational Advisory Boards, which constantly review and assist in upgrading the training programs and ensure we are providing the kinds of training that is going to get our students jobs.

Senator DEWINE. I appreciate your testimony very much. I might indicate to the audience that I have had the opportunity to visit the Job Corps in Dayton, as well as the one in Cincinnati and the one in Cleveland. You have been at the Dayton Job Corps how long?

Mr. AYDELOTT. Two years and about 2 months.

Senator DEWINE. You may not want to comment on this, but I will make a statement and then ask you to comment on another aspect.

You, by all indications, have significantly improved that site and that operation and what's going on there. I would ask you what you did when you came in there. What were some of the things that you did that you found, in your professional opinion, were necessary and you had been doing for many, many years? What made a difference?

Mr. AYDELOTT. I can tell you it is probably three bottom line issues that made a difference. I came in in March of 1993. We had to make some staff changes. We are a private company; so when we came in, we allowed the individuals under the previous contractor to apply for jobs, but we eliminated about 45 percent of those individuals. The competency had been demonstrated through past history, and they didn't meet our standards as a corporation.

The students were running the school. The school was not being run by an administration, so we immediately set about what we call the Zero Tolerance/No Tolerance concept: Not allowing gang graffiti, behavior, dress, signs; making sure that if you fought, you go. If you are caught in possession of alcohol on or off the facilities, or drugs, you are out of the program.

We took a very strong stand. Shoplifting in the community, which is bad for the Job Corps center and bad for the community, those students caught shoplifting were eliminated.

So, we took a strong discipline stand. Then we set in some very strong incentives for the student body, changing that whole culture from one that was negative and violent, to one that valued the safety of not having to worry about possessions being stolen or being intimidated by Joe or John and have to fight today. So, that was a very painful and hard process for all involved, just because the amount of resistance that you get in those situations.

Then we began working on the facilities, getting the facilities upgraded, making it a better, more attractive, better equipped vocational place. We obtained $200,000 of vocational equipment the first year so we could provide updated training.

The incentive system. I think I can't run a system on discipline. You have to give the carrot, too; and we started working for having the best dorms with the best vocational completion, reading and math. We awarded the dorm or student with the cleanest dorm, dorm of the month.

Senator DEWINE. Wasn't part of the change that you moved some of your own people in there?

Mr. AYDELOTT. Yes. I brought in less than five out of 113 who had Job Corps experience in the past with management training courses so they knew what needed to be done and that laid our groundwork, but we still hired mainly from the Ohio, Dayton/Cleveland area; and we now have about 50 percent of our entire population student body from Ohio, which is great to see.

Senator DEWINE. I want to follow up with some additional questions, but I think we should move on at this point.

Miss Green, what do you have to say?

Ms. GREEN. It is good to see you again, Senator, and it is good to be here with Gabriella.

Senator DeWine and related staff, I am grateful for the opportunity to testify here today on matters that have been and continue to be of great concern and interest for me, both as a private citizen and in my capacity as chairperson of the Partnership Ohio, Inc.

Partnership Ohio is a State association representing the Service Delivery Areas (SDAs)——

Senator DEWINE. Let me interrupt, if I could, for a moment. I will have to step out for a moment. If you could just continue and I will be back in a couple of minutes.

Ms. GREEN. That is fine. Partnership Ohio is a State association representing the Service Delivery Areas, the SDAs, and the Private Industry Councils, the PICs; and the Boards of local elected officials, the LEOs, that administer the most success Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) systems and programs.

In addition, I am the chairperson of PIC 17. This SDA includes Fayette, Pickaway, Fairfield, Ross, and Clinton Counties in south-central Ohio. I have served in this capacity for 4 years.

The membership of Partnership Ohio includes the PIC Chairs, LEOs, and Administrators that work to prepare the unemployed and underemployed for economic self-sufficiently.

The 30 SDAs in the State promote excellence in workforce development efforts in local communities and encourage successful practices in the conduct of local welfare to work initiatives.

Our collective experience represents over 15 years of local program management where we have learned to understand the dynamics of what is effective and what is not effective at the local level.

We understand and support efforts to refine and improve the many and varied programs now part of the employment and training system.

The senate committee is to be commended for its work over the past several years to consolidate the training programs. Based on a shrinking Federal budget and the need to provide services, it is imperative now, more than ever, that the emerging legislation include focused services and requires effective and efficient management.

However, Partnership Ohio is concerned about Block Grants that exclude local workforce boards, program accountability, and formula funding.

Our particular area of review today is the at-risk youth we serve. The examples I will present are representative of local programs that address our topics and the concerns of this panel.

I have provided a summary of a program in Canton called The Park Farms Project, which is in the folder. This highly success program is a result of the local PIC and local elected officials initiating and coordinating Canton Urban League and The Ohio Department of Development, local education resources and funded by JTPA.

This consolidated effort is designed to transition welfare youth, most of which are single parents, into good paying jobs with paid benefits.

Based upon the Private Industry Council's calculated return on investment, this program returns over $5 to the community for every dollar of JTPA funds invested.

Apart from its financial effectiveness, the real benefits are in the eyes of those youths who now have real opportunities to be productive citizens.

What makes this program work is a collective ownership of the program and the predetermined commitment of those involved to improve their community.

Commitment does not stand alone in the success of those programs. A successful program requires financial stability, regulatory flexibility, and management accountability.

Senator Kassebaum's current legislative proposal, though addressing the consolidation effort very well, does not address essential local governance policy. Channeling the funds through governors is not our concern. In Ohio, we appreciate Governor Voinovich's support of employment and training programs and applaud his efforts to streamline the system and make it customer friendly.

However, as the private sector is well aware, changes in managerial leadership often results in difficult transition periods; changes in State leadership could result in erratic policies and fluctuating funding streams.

A completely different program called the Academic Olympics For Kids, or AOK, was developed after my local Private Industry Council reviewed the needs in our five-county SDA of at-risk youth and their need for assistance in successfully completing the ninth-grade proficiency test.

This program was a double elimination competition, similar to Jeopardy, where students were quizzed on their knowledge of citizenship, mathematics, and history.

Other projects that were occurring simultaneously in SDA 17 were nursing assistants, clerical, career exploration and a teen learning commitment through caring which was a joint effort with MRDD and the community action agency where high-risk pupils served as daily peer tutors for the handicapped.

When educational programs like these are coupled with real work experience, as summer youth training programs are required to do, at-risk youth are offered a safety net to save them from academic backsliding and ultimately ending up further behind their peers or ending up on high school dropout lists. Programs like this require long-term commitment, planning, and financial stability.

My final example is the at-risk youth project in SDA 13, serving Ottawa, Erie, Huron, and Seneca Counties, identified a large unmet demand for new employees with basic metal-working skills.

The PIC responded to this need by initiating with the Vanguard JVS, a six-month machine trades program designed to meet the first level of the national metal-working skills standards.

After the third month of training, most of the 15 JTPA eligible students have been hired by manufacturers on a part-time basis and will combine work and training for the remaining 3 months.

The PIC has been told that employers are eager to increase their hours to full-time as soon as possible.

In addition, the PIC will provide 90 summer youth program participants with the opportunity to attend a 128 hour introduction to machines trades training. The goal is to interest youth in further vocational training as preparation for high-demand metal-working jobs.

These programs and hundreds like them are being operated across the State and the Nation.

Research indicates that relevant training combines academic learning with occupational skills, turning workplaces into learning environments and providing a context to classroom learning.

In order to accomplish this integration, these efforts require the deep involvement and support of a local business community.

Partnership Ohio believes that the emerging consolidation and Block Grant legislation must, at a minimum, incorporate provisions of existing law that supports systems that are effective.

Points outlining those provisions and unanimously supported by the County Commissioners Association of Ohio are as follows:

There must be effective fiscal and programmatic accountability at the local level, must be delivered at the local level by grant recipients and administrative entities that are governed by a real partnership of elected officials and local private sector representatives.

Two. There must be substantial and meaningful program development role for business and industry at the local level to ensure that individuals are trained and placed in private sector jobs.

Three. Consolidation legislation must include language that mandates a substate funding formula and should include formula elements that guarantee adequate funding to meet specific needs of localities.

Four. There must be a requirement that Governors establish workforce boards and that those boards enter into partnerships with local elected officials.

Five. The full range of training and employment services within a community must be accessible to our citizens. A local delivery system, governed by workforce boards, must be used to provide assessment, counseling, case management, supportive services job training referral, and placement services.

Six. To ensure all areas of the State are addressed and that services are delivered at the local level, local elected officials must be authorized to request designation as a locally based delivery area that Governors must approve so long as basic demographic and organizational considerations are met.

Seven. The broad use of training vouchers should only be adopted as part of a managed system of career guidance that ensures that clients have adequate information to make decisions regarding training and protects against fraud and abuse. Vouchers could be considered as a tool, among other options, in the local training arsenal.

Fifteen years of PIC experience demonstrates that an effective training system must involve the private sector—the ultimate customers of the system. Private sector involvement is essential to ensure that the training is relevant to employment opportunities in the local labor market.

The experiences of the state's PICs, or workforce boards, offer an ideal network to develop this local capacity. PICs represent a cadre of over 1800 community representatives, including over 500 committed business leaders, and a partnership among business, organized labor, local elected officials, government, education, and community groups.

The boards must have real authority and input to sustain the very important employer involvement. They must be allowed to continue to set goals, develop performance measures, approve budgets, and enforce decisions through oversight and evaluation.

Again, I thank the committee and Senator DeWine for the opportunity to speak before you today; and I would be glad to entertain any questions you may have.

Mr. SATTLER. Just so we can get it on the record, can you explain a little more about the Park Farms Program and how it runs, just for the audience, what they are doing in Canton?

Ms. GREEN. Let me get back to my section here where we discussed it.

As I understand the entities in Canton, the local activities of PIC were approached by Park Farms because they said, we are having difficulty in finding the people they needed.

They also were very interested in the community, very involved; and they wanted to be able to include the youth, the areas of the

population that they knew needed the most help, and they had a definite interest in that.

With the outstretched arm of local community agencies, such as the PIC and local government structure and local elected officials, it fit very well.

I understand they are going through a second class and there is talk of a third. So, it is something that looks like it will be progressing for the next few months and certainly provides a model.

As I understand, the Governor has been there a couple of times and was very pleased with what he saw.

Mr. SATTLER. My understanding with JTPA is people spend half a day with JTPA officials and half a day working. Do you have any further information on that?

Ms. GREEN. That is a very exemplary structure for a program that JTPA would put together: Combining workplace learning and all that brings to the concept of holding a job, being there, being a good employee and continuing the learning—in-school learning of the needs. So this is a very typical structure that JTPA puts together all over the State or country.

Mr. SATTLER. Do you have the information regarding how many students were in first place and how many now finishing? Do you know the percentage of that?

Ms. GREEN. I don't have that in hand, but it is in the packet.

Ms. CORBETT. Good morning. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to address you, Senator DeWine, and the members of your panel.

I am bringing a different perspective to the table this morning, one that includes both personal and professional experience as an individual, first of all, with a disability; and second of all, as a person who has been employed in the related field of rehabilitation to include working for the State vocational rehabilitation agency; and formerly, I was associated with the Federal government in charge of rebuilding a large, what eventually became an award winning EEO program that targeted the inclusion of qualified individuals with disabilities. And then, more recently, in my experience as the Executive Director for the Centers For Independent Living.

Senator, as you may be aware, the Centers For Independent Living are, in fact, the practical embodiment and national outgrowth and practice of the independent living movement and its philosophy.

This movement began at the end of the 60's and continued in the 1970's, and is still going forward as part of the civil rights movement to espouse inclusion of individuals with all different types of disabilities, regardless of what EEOC calls the nonmeritorious factors of age, disability type, or significance or severity of disability.

Centers For Independent Living, of course, have totally embraced this and are founded on the principle of cross-disability as part of our terms of existence.

We are a majority governed, managed, and started with individuals with a variety of significant disabilities and work with other individuals with disabilities in our respective communities to provide, not only our independent living services, but also to, in general, support individuals with disabilities in their efforts to go forward and access the services so desperately needed.

We are also there to break down the barriers that are constantly creating obstacles to the full inclusion process for persons with disabilities.

Nowhere more is this seen than in the realm of employment. I am here today speaking to you as a member of America's largest minority and America's largest minority that has the highest unemployment rate, that of 75 percent.

Despite the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 ensuring the demise of discrimination against individuals with disabilities in the application for or continuation in employment, our unemployment rate has risen.

While we agree nationally there are many factors that are associated with it, we do see this as a very significant set of figures and one we feel that the committee needs to be addressing as you go forward and examine a consolidation process for workforce development.

Our number one premise is—if you hear nothing else—is the full inclusion of persons with disabilities. Anything else represents a segregatory practice and results in separation akin to apartheid.

You wouldn't separate us if we were sitting here before you as individuals with African-American heritage, or Hispanic, or even in my status based on my gender as a woman. Please do not do this to myself or my colleagues and my peers on the basis of our respective disabilities.

We welcome the opportunity to work with you in developing a difficult, but what we believe and are committed to being an effective transitional process to go forward with the full inclusion of persons with disabilities in a revised workforce development plan and subsequent act.

The National Council On Independent Living, which is our national organization, has put together a paper which is before you today. The position paper has several sets of recommendations which I will not read into the record at this point, but just reference.

The key factors that we need to continue to stress are the needs for full access for all individuals with all disabilities, cross-disabilities, which means that we eliminate and otherwise do away with disability specific or disability-type kinds of programming.

In other words, programs that are set up exclusively for persons who use wheelchairs and have a certain type of disability, such as cerebral palsy or persons who are deaf, and only use sign language. There isn't any reason why such individuals cannot, in private matters, continue as friends, etc, etc, and colleagues; but in an actual setting, such segregation cannot continue.

We also are espousing for the fact that we want to see consumers—which is the word we prefer to the word client—able to access the greatest level of choice.

When a consumer approaches a college guidance counselor, for example, discussions are held relative to the identification of the pursuit of the education and training needed to declare a major and go forward to become occupationally prepared.

For so many individuals with disabilities, that same process does not happen. That process becomes obscured by contact with indi-

viduals who continue to see the disability and not the person behind that disability.

While there are many individuals who are very competent in the current State vocational rehabilitation system, a great many of those individuals are not only professional with regard to educational levels, they are also caring individuals.

Nonetheless, the system itself has become a source of oppression. Interview eight out of ten consumers in any State in this country and you will hear comments which are negative with regards to that individual's or those individuals' experiences with their respective State vocational rehabilitation process.

My remarks exceed, obviously, the State of Ohio. As a Cincinnatian, I am in a unique position to also be associated from time to time with members from the cabinet who work for development in Kentucky and have had an opportunity to work both sides of the Ohio River and to work with their vocational rehabilitation systems as well.

Again, I repeat and reiterate, caring individuals, but a system which oppresses; and we need to see this stopped.

Consistent with our national organization's position, we espouse the need for full inclusion. We would be happy to provide the members of the committee with our very best technical assistance in how to make that happen, as long as we could receive from the members of the committee majority support and commitment to implement full inclusion.

We do not want to maintain a separate VR system. There may be a place for VR individuals, personnel, etc; but to maintain segregation in this day and age, 1995, as we are looking at the very beginning of the next century, and the development of a workforce that is qualified and skilled, we cannot continue to segregate.

I think it is important that you are also aware of some of the specific experiences that do occur that the Center For Independent Living often is in a position of mopping up.

Oftentimes, a consumer will approach rehab and a consumer has identified training, a goal, or occupational objective. The experience is that they are told that that goal would not be, quote-unquote, appropriate. The word appropriate is used against us.

My able-bodied peers do not have that label used against them, unless they are individuals who are part of the at-risk group. I think that this kind of stuff has to stop; it is patronizing.

When an individual person wishes to pursue academic skills upgrading, despite the billions of dollars expended in the past few years for special education, so many individuals with disabilities are still not academically proficient to the point of being able to be successful at a collegiate level; and we all know, I think—and some of the testimony that we heard earlier this morning stressed—the critical nature of skills development, which includes the foundation of academic preparation.

Hold us, as people with disabilities, to the same standards of accountability as you would for nondisabled people. We are not special. Do not oppress us with the use of the word "special". We have disability-specific needs. I need a wheelchair; someone else needs a piece of assistive technology, such as a talking computer or com-

munication device; someone else uses a TVD; someone else uses a guide or service dog. Those are simply aids.

Put us in charge of our own lives. That is what independent living is all about. We, like anyone else, want to participate fully in the workplace, the community, marry, have children, go on and live our lives. Please help us to advance.

I think the time has come to not just reform the system, but to examine the need for a complete, radical change.

Thank you very much. I appreciate your time this morning.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. Could you tell us briefly what the Center for Independent Living organization does?

Ms. CORBETT. I would be very happy to. The Center for Independent Living organization was founded in 1977 by individuals with very significant disabilities.

The center became operational in 1980, when it received funding from the U.S. Department of Education and Rehabilitation Services Administration.

The center serves individuals with a variety of significant disabilities, and most recently—we just completed our 1994 report. We served during that program year a total of 182 individuals. Our specific services—and this is something that all the federally funded and in-compliance Centers for Independent Living must do—is we provide information and referral services that is customized and targeted to the needs of both nondisabled community members, as well as community members with disabilities. We provide a service of individualized and group support services.

More recently, for example, hosting a group for mothers with disabilities to examine what their particular parenting needs might be and how to integrate this group into other parenting groups.

We also provide individual living skills training on an individualized and small group basis, which can include things as basic as learning how to budget, or things as sophisticated as how to really develop a plan to obtain home ownership.

Too many people with disabilities are stuck on a variety and myriad of federally funding sources for their sustenance; and we are hoping to rid some of that, which brings me, naturally, to our full course service of individualized system advocacy. We are working with consumers to try to more effectively work with those systems that so greatly oppress people.

It is ironic, because the systems were set up originally to be a source of help; but as we all know, times change and sometimes the best intentions do not always work out. So, that is why we once again compliment the committee in its radical approach for examining all of these issues.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much.

Ms. CORBETT. Thank you.

Senator DEWINE. Ninia Downs.

Ms. DOWNS. Good morning. I thank you, Senator, for the opportunity to take part in this hearing.

I am Ninia Downs, Executive Director of government programs for the Ohio Restaurant Association and Programs Director for Ladders To Success.

I suppose a trade association having such a position in some way vindicates the size and influence of government on business affairs.

I am also here as Director of the Ladders To Success Program. Ladders is a project with Industry Program. It was created by the Rehabilitation Act in 1968. Its purpose is to develop cooperative arrangements between rehabilitation organizations, and private employers to build competitive employment programs for persons with disabilities.

As a PWI, Ladders To Success provides job training and placement assistance to businesses and to people with severe disabilities throughout the State of Ohio.

Ladders To Success is a cooperative effort between the Ohio Restaurant Association and the Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission, which provides vocational rehabilitation services and is known as RSC.

Our program is funded by RSC and a small grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Rehabilitation Services Administration and contributions from the Ohio Restaurant Association and other members of our business advisory council.

Ladders helps employees find suitable job applicants to meet their current and future needs. People with disabilities have a wealth of talents to offer, and they definitely want to work.

Businesses, especially those with high turnover rates such as the hospitality industry, desperately need people who are dependable, capable, and willing to work. The match is really obviously.

Ladders staff work as liaisons with Rehabilitation Services Commission counselors to match an employer's requirements with the skills and qualifications of job seekers.

The Ladders PWI Program differs from other job placement programs. Business is recognized as a full partner. Our Business advisory Council is key to every aspect of the program, from determining labor market trends to designing training which meets employer needs.

Our 16 member advisory council includes people with a variety of expertise, from the Executive Director of the Ohio Restaurant Association, to the Executive Director of the Ohio Hotel/Motel Association, to the Executive Director of the Grocers' Association.

Other council members also include staff from RSC, and a State supervisor for the Ohio Department of Education, and representatives from three trade unions. Most important, people with disabilities are also represented on our Business Advisory Council.

We have adopted a marketing approach to job placement. Great care is taken to ensure that the employer's needs are met. Employers are the customer, and job placements will not occur if their needs are ignored.

Since Ladders began in 1985, more than 800 people have been placed into competitive entry-level and skilled jobs.

One of the program's strongest supporters is also one of Ohio's most successful restaurant chains. Over the past 4 years, top management at Bob Evans has worked with RSC and Ladders staff to design, implement, and maintain a quality program which fills entry-level jobs and helps people with disabilities to go to work.

From a small training effort in one Bob Evans unit in Columbus, this successful program has grown to one that today can recruit, hire, train, and support qualified workers for any unit throughout Ohio.

Sixty-two people have filled entry-level jobs in 28 Bob Evans restaurants in positions ranging from busser to dishtank operator to grill cook, server, and hostess.

These workers have a variety of disabilities, including mental retardation, traumatic brain injury, deafness, cerebral palsy, blindness, and epilepsy. Their similarity is a desire to work. Of these 62 individuals, 28 maintained their employment for more than 1 year, and 24 of them are still working today.

We also place people in other businesses and in other industries. During 1994, for example, people with disabilities were placed in jobs as administrative assistants, receptionists, draftsmen, data entry clerks, housekeepers, tax examiners, travel consultants, and a variety of other occupations. Hourly wages ranged from $4.25 for a packer/line worker to $12 for a teacher. These are good jobs which offer many opportunities.

Over the past 4 years, we have met stringent Federal standards and indicators of success in order to receive continued funding. We know the number of persons served disabled, the number who have been unemployed at least 6 months, the increase in earnings of people placed into jobs, and the cost per job placement.

Ladders has tracked the number of people placed and served who had received Social Security Disability Income or Supplemental Security Income in the month prior to placement. It is especially important to note that 47 of 92 placed in jobs by the program last year had been receiving Social Security Disability Income or Supplemental Security Income in the month prior to placement.

These persons are usually considered among the most difficult cases since the law requires that persons prove they cannot work before they can be declared eligible for benefits.

Persons receiving SSI or SSDI are often very reluctant to go to work for fear that they will lose medical or other benefits.

But, the program that we work with has demonstrated that with adequate support, both from business and from rehabilitation, that these people can and do go to work.

I will now respond directly and very briefly to the three questions I was given concerning the private sector and job training.

Is it important for the private sector to be involved in job training?

You bet. Businesses have the jobs. They have the jobs of today, and they also know what the jobs of tomorrow will be.

All businesses benefit from being involved.

They all need qualified workers to fill their jobs; and the cost of recruitment, training, and retention of qualified workers is very high.

What can be done to promote private sector involvement?

Make business a full partner. Do not just let them sit on some kind of council and rubber stamp the program. Get them actively involved. Treat them as a valued customer.

Listen to their needs and meet them.

Make them key in every aspect, in the design and in the delivery of job training.

Continue the State VR programs as a partner with business. The partnership between Ladders and RSC is and has been vital to our program's success.

RSC's professional counselors screen and refer suitable candidates to Ladders for on-site job training and for job placement.

RSC also offers some support services that are very necessary to keep people in jobs. These services include rehabilitation technology and job-site modifications to enable a person to do a job, and job coaching services to assure that an individual learns assigned duties.

A field visit to a McDonald's unit in Toledo not too long ago presented some real surprises for me. I discovered that every single worker in that particular unit on that one afternoon were graduates of the Ladders program. They are people who would not have previously been considered for employment there—especially, the grill cook. The grill cook was deaf.

Not too long ago somebody who was deaf would be considered inappropriate for such a job. How the heck can they hear when somebody asks for a quarter pounder or three big macs?

This person did hear this afternoon. He heard a little differently. He heard with the aid of adaptive equipment. A buzzer device around his waist alerted him to what was needed in this particular unit.

I have found knowledge provided by rehabilitation counselors is vital to the success of our program because of the unique needs and concerns of people with disabilities.

The role of the Federal government is to see that administrations get funding and expertise is made available to ensure individuals with disabilities have access and appropriate opportunities to receive job training services and to secure meaningful employment.

Reduce that daggone red tape that keeps us tied to our offices and keeps us from our real work.

To provide guidelines that establish minimum performance standards.

Hold states accountable for outcomes.

Continue Projects with Industry as a federally funded program. It is a project that works.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today. I will be happy to answer your questions.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much for the testimony from all of you. Miss Downs, how many people did you say go through this program every year? What is the average?

Ms. DOWNS. We average about a hundred.

Senator DEWINE. About a hundred. What prevents that program from being expanded further? It seems to be a program that does work.

Ms. DOWNS. Funding. It is a very small program that is really somewhat of a demonstration program.

Senator DEWINE. What is the funding—I mean, what is the cost?

Ms. DOWNS. The cost is $300,000 a year. We haven't been using all of that money. We have been using about $200,000.

Senator DEWINE. And that comes from three sources, I understand?

Ms. DOWNS. Yes. It comes primarily from the Rehabilitation Services Commission; and involved in that half of those funds come from the U.S. Department of Education's Rehabilitation Services Administration from that project within the industry grant.

Senator DEWINE. Miss Corbett, let me turn back to you, if I could. You talked about a radical change in our approach, as a society, really. I'm a little unclear, though, exactly what you will do. You talk a little bit about that, you talk about what is wrong with the current system of segregation, the way the current system works. What will you replace that with?

Ms. CORBETT. I appreciate the question. First of all, I would like to respond to you, Senator, both as an executive director of my own center rather than creating the impression that I am speaking for the network of more than 300 centers across the country.

My particular belief is to incorporate and integrate the VR process or system, as we currently know it, you could take the services for persons for visual and blindness, as well as the general rehab industries in each of the 50 states, and include them into your proposed One-Stop Job Centers.

What I think is critical, though, is that a separate stream of funding needs to be reserved that would be ideally equal to the current $2 billion that I think is the current tab for a vocational rehab.

Those funds need to be used as a source of something that we, in independent living, refer to as disability support. Those funds could be utilized to purchase an augmentive communication device or some other form of assistive technology that would be needed by that individual so they could more equitably participate.

Personal assistant services is very key. Personal assistant services basically allows the consumer to hire those personal aides that an individual, with whatever their particular—usually disability—related issues may be.

For some people using wheelchairs, it can be assistance in getting up in the morning and getting ready. If they cannot do that for themselves, they need to have somebody do that for them so they can participate.

For other individuals—and I am sure there will be a shudder in this room when I mention it—but many persons who are, for example, blind or have visual disabilities or persons who are deaf or hard of hearing, the use of readers and interpreters are often referred to, generically, as personal assistants, but we think it is important that access to those services must be assured and must be easily available.

Hoops and obstacles, once again, need to be removed. Persons with disabilities are dealing with a lot of system issues that are similar to, but have problems different from what the able-bodied community is dealing with.

Accessible transportation. Eliminating the current ADA bashing that has been occurring, particularly with respect to the current transit authority all around our State.

Assuring there is accessible transportation. It is a thousand times cheaper when it is done on a large bus than through a para-transit system. The cost difference in Cincinnati is less than $2 versus $16 a ride. Assuring those kinds of supports are there. That will require a series of legislative changes.

I also believe that it may be appropriate to include in the staffing of your One-Stop Job Training and Education Centers individuals who do have experience with disabilities, professional-level experi-

ence, and ideally employees themselves may be persons with disabilities.

I think the Centers for Independent Living could function as a source of external technical assistance and as resources, working via advocacy to assist people in a problem-solving process.

One thing I think essential is to require academic skills development upgrading and specific job skills training. Something that is marketable as you would want for your family members, as I would.

Senator DEWINE. Let me make sure I understand. You have been critical of the current BVR system. Are you saying, basically, we should blow it up and start all over again? That is the impression I get. I want to make sure I am not misunderstanding.

Ms. CORBETT. I think at this time rather than suggest an explosion or implosion, my suggestion would be an incorporation. Take DR and move it into the One-Stop service. No longer allow it to exist as a separate entity because of the continued sponsorship of the segregation. I noticed this morning——

Senator DEWINE. You think it is a cultural problem?

Ms. CORBETT. A very large cultural problem; and several of the individuals this morning made wonderful comments and talked extensively, but everything was stated in terms of the able-bodied citizen.

If you noted, in a lot of the Job Corps training discussed this morning, we need to get every able-bodied citizen back to work or to work for the first time.

That means I and my peers are exempt from that expectation. See, we are separate, we are relegates.

Senator DEWINE. If I understand what you are saying, you have also been critical of the current BVR system as too bureaucratic, costly, and inefficient.

Ms. CORBETT. Yes.

Senator DEWINE. That is different than saying it is a cultural program or different from saying it is a mind set program.

Ms. CORBETT. Well, actually, I believe most of my comments were addressing the attitudinal barriers.

Senator DEWINE. That is what I wanted to understand.

Ms. CORBETT. Let me clarify that. We think there is a possible transition that can utilize the best of the VR system as it goes forward and transform it into an integrated system of workforce development and training.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you. Let me get back to you, if I could. You have talked about the cost; and clearly, when you have any resident administration program, the cost is going to be relatively high or at least, if you compare it to nonresidential, with the amount of money that will be spent next year as determined by Congress, what is the justification for spending 21 or $22,000 per year per individual in a residential program, such as Job Corps, versus taking that same amount of money and maybe dealing with four or five individuals instead of one in a cheaper program, because those are the choices we make. We do not have an perfect world. We have a world where we have a larger number of people who need help, and we can help or help them help themselves. How do we deal with that? Justify it for me.

Mr. AYDELOTT. I think you are going to get, certainly, more back for your buck. You will get greater change in a residential program.

In a program operating just during the course of the day, I do not think the changes are as dramatic. It is more difficult to break cycles. It is more difficult to develop self-esteem, develop the kinds of skills necessary, I think, to be successful in the work world.

It can be—many times they will go back home to environments where here is a stupid kid who never had the ability to learn; and it is a little harder when you go back to that every night, and then try and go back every day to try and believe that you are somebody and that you can do something with your life and you do have the skill and ability to get a GED when previously everybody in the family told you would never amount to anything.

I think a residential program certainly gives you a better percentage of change. It is more expensive; but I think what you get for what you spend, you get a better deal.

Senator DEWINE. How would you compare Job Corps with the San Jose CET program?

Mr. AYDELOTT. I am very interested in that program. It sounds like something—I just heard about it this morning, but I am very interested in that concept. I think the Job Corps is—well, there are many things that can be improved, but one thing I think that can be improved is the linkages between businesses and Job Corps Centers. Even though they are all required to have advisory councils, I think we need to become more involved.

There was definitely a problem, as we heard from the first panel, on information systems. I know I experienced it trying to make Job Corps vocational changes. Trying to coordinate what is going on in all five states is a—I make a dozen phone calls and finally get to the man in the basement who is working on it.

Senator DEWINE. You found him? I have been looking for him. [Laughter.]

Mr. AYDELOTT. It is not put together in an effective system so you can really know what is out there, what schools are training what right now. Are we going to saturate the market by training kids in a certain field? There are only 15 schools, and the market is flooded, and I am training them here in Dayton. There needs to be pertinent informational systems.

Senator DEWINE. What would you say to the argument or question I raised earlier to another panel: In Dayton you have only about half the people there who are students from Ohio?

Mr. AYDELOTT. Right.

Senator DEWINE. You have some from as far away as Minnesota.

Mr. AYDELOTT. I have some kids from Wisconsin, I think.

Senator DEWINE. What did you do with the argument that says that is really not the best way to assure someone gets a job? I mean, statistically, some may stay in the Dayton area, or Ohio area, but most go back home, generally, or at least initially. What is the linkage to the local community? Why are we not better off having Job Corps-type operation programs that are better anchored in the local community so a hundred percent of the students are from the local area and then you build up your long-term relationships with trade unions or employers or whatever the network is?

In my experience in talking to other people around the State, so much of this is informal and so much is gee, I have this good student, and here is what he can do, or she can do, and why not try them; and, yeah, I will. Do you not lose some of that when you are in Dayton and this young person is going back to Chicago?

Mr. AYDELOTT. Yeah. It does have some disjunction in it, no doubt about it. We are dependent on the placing agencies who live in Chicago.

Senator DEWINE. And they do not work for you.

Mr. AYDELOTT. They do not work for me. They, of course, operate through the Department of Labor; but they are not obligated to me, except to place students, which we are commonly linked by.

I have certain priorities that I have to meet, so that is our common linkage. Some of the programs, like Home Builders Institute, which teaches three trades in my center, have better linkages out there.

In Dayton, I have tried to get linked-up with an apartment association so I can assist some of my students who come out with painting and carpentry trades in getting jobs, as well as being linked in Ohio with that organization. So, I think there are some formal things that can be put in place to make it much more effective. It is, sometimes, difficult to make all of those problems——

Senator DEWINE. If you were starting over and designing a Job Corps-type program, let's assume it is residential, what else would you do differently than what you have already said? You talked about some things.

Mr. AYDELOTT. I have talked to you in the past about sometimes having more control factors in my own hands, recruiting my own students, and having placement arrangements within my own organization, my own center, to help the continuity of servicing. That would be something I would probably look at.

Senator DEWINE. Because currently you do not control intake; is that correct?

Mr. AYDELOTT. Yes. Some centers have outreach training and placement contracts, and I do not have that contract attached to my contract, so I do not have people who go out and do screening and outreach efforts to the local communities and schools and then do the same thing and place the student in all areas; and that is difficult.

We have large centers such as Clearfield, that offers advanced training; and they may have students from 44 states out of the 50. They have a good placement percentage, but they also have outreach screening and placement attached, so they have people spending their entire day making those linkages back home.

Senator DEWINE. You are actually an employee of the contracting agency?

Mr. AYDELOTT. That is correct. I am an employee of a private management contract corporation.

Senator DEWINE. What about the relationship between that entity and the labor department? Are you being required to do things that you think are either stupid or a waste of time or need changed?

Mr. AYDELOTT. Oh, yeah, yeah.

Senator DEWINE. Not that the government would ever do anything stupid.

Mr. AYDELOTT. No, no;, I would never say that; but there are some unnecessary hoops to jump, some redundant kinds of things.

Senator DEWINE. Let's talk about that.

Mr. AYDELOTT. I must say that we are very strictly held in terms of accountability. Our feet are held to the fire in terms of gangs and those kinds of things.

Senator DEWINE. I must say one thing that came out of a previous hearing in Washington that I perceived as a problem. I do not know about you, but you are adjudged in many ways and held accountable in many ways; but you are not really held accountable in the only way that matters, and that is what that student is doing a year from after he or she graduates, or 2 years or 3 years or 5 years, and it seems to me that is the only test that really matters.

If I was the parent of that student, or if I was that student, that is what I would care about. I wouldn't care about how many I's you dot or T's you crossed or what you did on a daily basis. I would care about results.

It seems to me you are held accountable based on process. Just a comment. You do not have to comment on that.

Mr. AYDELOTT. I understand where you are coming from in terms of the long-term placement. I think that is certainly something that should be looked at. It is a very expensive proposition, as you well know, to follow people. As transient as our population is, that can be very, very expensive.

But there are certain routine paperwork things where you are evaluated on what seems like double jeopardy.

Redetermination rate, we used to be scored on that in terms of whether a student successfully completed the program and left. That was held against us because it was counted in as successes and failures.

So it was oranges to pears and nuts and shells.

Senator DEWINE. Would any of the other panel members like to comment on any of the other comments made by anyone here? This is your last shot.

Ms. CORBETT. I would.

Senator DEWINE. OK.

Ms. CORBETT. Briefly, I would love to just share a couple of quick ideas I think are applicable to all the individuals at this panel.

I think it would be very encouraging if the members of your committee, Senator, would examine the creative uses of some of the things that already exist.

For example, the office of personnel management for Federal civilian employment has an appointment authority that is utilized for noncompetitive appointments for individuals with disabilities and individuals that meet other types of criteria.

I believe there is a category for at-risk youth. I am no longer in personnel, and I am fuzzy on this stuff; but they have a personnel manual that would fill up this entire building if ever printed out.

I would still suggest that that be used as a possible appointing authority linked to individuals who have participated through the One-Stop Training Center to create placement of a duration of 6

months to 1 year so that people—for full-time placement so people have an opportunity to develop real work experience, even if it is an unpaid work experience.

The unions that we are associated with, the Department of Treasury, were, in fact, very supportive of the use of these authorities.

It would be my anticipation that other Federal unions would be able to handle this kind of thing, too; that it wouldn't take a great deal of negotiations. I think that would provide in my experience, contrary to what many people's perception is in the general public, the individuals who work for the Federal government are generally hard working, diligent, competent individuals; and I think there is a lot there that could help build skill, the character traits that were emphasized by one of the previous panelist, etc.

It also builds a heck of a great work reference and for individuals with disabilities dealing with benefit issues, etc, etc.

I also would suggest you pursue looking at a mentoring program, pulling in the members of the private sector, as deemed appropriate by the local private industry councils.

I think that, again, that represents an opportunity that is invaluable. It is something money cannot buy as far as helping people to receive the support and access to what it is they need to succeed.

I would also like to recommend that the use of Pell Grants are made available; however, that Pell Grants may no longer be utilized in any facility or any vocational training facility that would be proprietary in nature. I think those funds should be used only by nonprofit educational organizations and not some of these rip-off schools, to put it bluntly.

I think that is very important. I think, too, often I have met, and I think all of my colleagues at this table have met individuals who worked very, very hard to complete a training program only to find out that they were really not properly trained or adequately trained or properly credentialed; and I think that is really criminal.

Hold on a second.

I would also like to recommend that a corporation one-on-one study or course work be developed that would again involve partnership between the private sector and that that was required course work for all participants to at least spend at least a quarter having on-site association, unpaid work experience, or some other type of exposure to a real workplace.

One of the things I was able to bring to the rehab system when I became employed by them, which is more than 10 or 12 years ago, is I, myself, had experience in working for a lot of different members of the private sector. I worked for a steel mill, in a factory to put myself through school. I was a wonder waitress, and it gave me exposure as to what the world of work was like.

My colleagues in the rehab system are entering that workforce directly out of school, so it doesn't provide that person with the same level of experience. I think that is vital. Thank you.

Ms. HERNANDEZ. I would like to say back to when I was on welfare, it was hard for me to move up to start a job because I didn't have any training. My only education was high school. I tried to look for ways; and when JTPA came, I was glad. I was glad be-

cause they offered me what I needed, and it offered what I needed and what the people that are on welfare need.

Many of us do not have a car. JTPA offers transportation. That was a lot for us because we didn't have transportation. That was the only thing keeping us from going to work. They were offering that and that helped us a lot. We started working, we had a little bit of money, we could buy a car.

Then we went on to further steps. I decided I wanted education. Since I was very young, the only thing that stopped me was financial. Financially, I didn't have any money, and my parents didn't have any money to send me to school, and that is all I needed; and thanks to the JTPA program, it helped me and others, helped us for two or 3 years, and then we are on our own.

Whenever we felt like I can't make it, we would go to them. We had somebody to go to and say, I cannot do it. I do not know if I can keep on going another month; and they would encouraged us and they were there to hear us and encourage us. It is just one more month; and after that, you are on your own. Just one more month and they would encourage us.

Every time I would go, they were there. If I couldn't go to college because it was too far and it was winter and I couldn't go that far, I would go to their office and do my homework there and having the faculty there close to me was a big help, big help. Thanks.

Senator DEWINE. OK. Anyone else?

Ms. GREEN. Senator DeWine, since you were not able to hear some of my comments, I would like to pull together some of the things that all the members of the panel have been saying as a point of emphasis.

Significance relevant training, combined with academic learning, taking it to the workplace and making that individual someone who can be well paid, with benefits, a long-term employee that is going to be in the community for an extended.

One of the concerns that you were mentioning to Doug and asking him to defend is why spend a lot of money on a certain program for one individual? We looked at that several times in my Private Industry Council, and our concern is how are we the best keepers of the treasury and spending it well and have the most people served.

One thing we determined a long time ago was that some individuals are going to have more money spent and some less. But, our responsibilities and the structure we set up was if we serve you one time, we do not want to see you anymore. We want to serve you well and have you be able to be a member of the community. That is part of the concept I am hearing from the other members and the support, the partnering with the current Job Training Partnership Act. We know that that is certainly involved to some other resemblance of that structure, but our emphasis is we take the parts of the system that are defective and build it into a system that will be workable for each State and then bring it local and make that money spend well with local input in tying the private sector into it because they know exactly what they need.

Senator DEWINE. Good. Thank you very much. I want to thank all the members of the panel for your testimony. It has been very helpful.

I invite our third panel to come forward, and we will take a 5-minute break. Thank you. [Recess.]

Let's start with Arnold Tompkins.

**STATEMENT OF ARNOLD TOMPKINS, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES; DEBRA BOWLAND, ADMINISTRATOR OF HUMAN SERVICES, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICES; ELAINE HAIRSTON, OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS; JOE ROBERTSON, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT; JOHN GOFF, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; AND ROBERT RABE, OHIO REHABILITATION COMMISSION**

Mr. TOMPKINS. Thank you. It is a pleasure to talk to you about a compelling issue, one that the governor of the State of Ohio has spent much time on.

The Department of Human Services primary objective in the jobs and training area is in providing training and jobs to its recipients. We have a good record here in the State of Ohio in the job opportunities and basic skill training program.

The State of Ohio is at the top of the states in our participation in the JOBS Program. In fact, we have more participants in the JOBS Program than even California and a few larger states. Even with those numbers, we have a long way to go to have our participation be in the area we want it.

I think the biggest issue we have is a collaboration of programs. I have spoken with Debra Bowland next to me, Miss Bowland and other members of the cabinet, as well as other educational institutions, as to how we can put our programs together to become a functioning unit to where we can provide skills to all of our people.

The one idea is we participate with the $30 million of JOBS that is coordinated with the JTPA program. I think it is a good example of how we can function together.

In the environment that we are experiencing now, in both the welfare as well as the general population, I think it is important that we have program collaboration.

The issue is the responsibility and the opportunity in the government's eyes and how we can bring those together to provide, not only training to our recipients, but those who may become our recipients over time because of losing jobs, as well as needing training for further employment, and what have you.

We break down into many different initiatives in this program of self-sufficiency, but our whole issue is to take our welfare program and work in a development area. Take our people and programs and look at not only how we can provide them jobs, but how that can be an impetus to the economic development of the State.

One of the biggest issues that I think the government brings up quite frequently is that by the year 2020, and certainly by the year 2030, the minority population of this country will be the majority population in the country.

If we look at a disproportional State of the individuals on the welfare system, or nonworking, or what have you, the high unemployment rate of the inner city, or what have you, it becomes incumbent that we draw our programs together to become competitive in the world and in the marketplace.

It is not just an issue of welfare and welfare reform, but the program should be one of productively and achieving success necessary in our economic system in use in the United States.

We try to draw on and we look at several different areas as being very important to this whole interest here. We think that the groups we should concentrate our time on to some degree are those leaving high school, recently unemployed, those with disabilities, those dependent on welfare, those about to exit the prison system, and the underemployed who want to get ahead.

If we could look at those six major vulnerable areas of transition and the needs that they have and provide the unemployment services to those functions, I think we could go a long way in providing the needed services.

Ohio is embarking on several things that could be very helpful. We have the EZ/EC Program, as well as a communities opportunity program that are coming into Ohio in the near future which can work together with the Department of Public Development and somewhat with OBES and somewhat with the Welfare Department and Human Services Department in providing them with the key components to working with the private sector, working with folks coming into the system, as well as people here that want to expand their business, as well as ones that want to create businesses within the inner city, and give them an impetus that they could provide them with training recipients of ours, as well as give them some break, because some employers seem to think our employees—and this may be the case in some instances, they are not trustworthy to come to work, or whatever, and they need a little more training than the other individuals; and we will help them with that over time and make that plausible, so that the small businesses will not be hurt.

To get to the final point I want to make here today, as we go through, we see that at the Federal level—and I spent some years there—they always look at how we want to combine programs without really thinking about the next—to match the programs—without really thinking about what is it we really want to achieve here.

What is the final goal? What are the objectives here we want to get to? The objectives here we want to provide are employment and training, educational programs that lead to that, the School-To-Work effort, all the types of things that lead to that and have been espoused about over the years; and I think we are now trying to implement in the State of Ohio the use of all programs and all the people at this table to get to that point.

There are a couple of examples in the present bills that we are talking about where maybe we get into programs. We have the JOBS Program, the action with both the welfare reform bill, as well as this one we are talking about.

I think the objective is that you cannot deal with welfare reform, you cannot deal with health care reform and all these reforms without dealing with jobs and training and what have you. It is all connected and very viable to each other.

I have seen some great working relationships recently; and I think we have seen some great, great things we can do, but we need the flexibility to do those things. There are stops and restric-

tions on both the sharing of information, as well as the types of people we deal with.

So, with that, I would just like to thank you for this opportunity and hope that some of my comments can trigger some of the things that come about, as well as to leave you with the final point that the Governor always makes: That as we go through the process, be conscious of the fact that states are in just as vulnerable of a situation as the government is; and as we look at this, when the hard times hit, we need some trigger mechanism to help us in these Block Grants because if the unemployment rate goes up and what have you, happens over time, this could have a disastrous effect on the states as well.

Senator DEWINE. Let's turn now to Debra Bowland.

Ms. BOWLAND. I thank you very much, and I would like to start by saying how much we have appreciated you and your staff and your intensity in learning about our programs in Ohio and the needs that we have to reflect better legislation, so we thank you very much.

I am currently serving as the Administrator of Human Services, or OBES. OBES serves over 600,000 Ohio workers and more than 215,000 employers across the State every year.

I think you should know we do provide income maintenance while workers seek their next job, and we provide job training to keep worker skills competitive in the marketplace.

I think most important is that we do provide job matching skills so that workers and employers can hook up with each other, and we are using the very first computer based matching program anywhere in the country. So, putting people to work is very important and is, really, the very cornerstone of our programs.

I would like to talk about some of those things that I think is outstanding about Ohio's training system, and some of the unique things we are involved in.

You know OBES coordinates and helps staff the Governor's Human Resources Investment Council. That council is co-chaired by Lieutenant Governor Hollister, and most of the cabinet folks at this table are intimately involved in that council.

The cooperation, I think, of the partners at this table came about because Governor Voinovich has been incredibly visionary about what he would like us to do. We are one of nine such councils certified by USDOL in the Nation.

We receive direct instructions from the Governor. His role is to create a high-performance workforce in Ohio so that all Ohioans can increase and maximize their self esteem and be sure Ohio employers have the workforce that they need in this troubled economy.

I think our initial efforts have been spectacular. Very quickly, we are currently in that council working to improve our employment and training system; and we are already coordinating, as you folks are talking about it—we have some projects on literacy and basic skills programs to assist in creating a high-performance workplace: ISO 9,000, School-To-Work, Customer Service Centers, Ohio Job Net, and welfare reform.

I think that flexible Block Grants from the Federal government will greatly help Ohio improve its workforce development system.

Recently, Republican governors outlined a statement of principles for a workforce development Block Grant. Among those principles was that Block Grants of funds in this area should provide governors with the resources necessary to ensure that members of the workforce have the education and skills necessary for their employers to compete successfully in the global marketplace, so that the workers cannot only obtain basic self-sufficiency, but also be paid wages sufficient to maintain the highest quality of life in the world. These goals mirror ours in Ohio.

In Ohio, our road map is matching them with Jobs: "Ohio's Future" which outlines a comprehensive employment and training system. Looking at any one piece of our workforce development system in isolation is not sufficient.

We do not look at that system as an isolated, piecemeal program. We evaluate our workforce development system in the document called Windows of Opportunity, and we found there was nearly $1 billion allocated to 15 State agencies responsible for 51 workforce development programs.

"Jobs: Ohio's Future" contains Ohio goals to make businesses more competitive in the global marketplace, to ensure that all Ohioans achieve the skills and abilities they need to succeed in a high-performance workplace, and to help all Ohioans and their families become self-sufficient.

I can tell you all day about how we are working toward these goals. I can tell you about Ohio's Customer Service Centers, the foundation of Ohio's Employment and Training System. I can explain how programs in those centers—11 now are open—include partners all over the State who are developing local and State planning as we further this initiative in Ohio.

I would like to emphasize there has been no Federal prescription in how they forged those relationships in Ohio. All of our partners work together to meet Ohio's needs.

I would like to tell you how we work toward high-performance workplaces and self-sufficiency through Ohio Job Net.

I would like to tell you about the newest development of Ohio Job Net. It is self-service kiosks, which provides self-service for folks; and we could even put those in remote situations. We currently are placing 180 of those kiosks at OBES offices, local JTPA offices, and other remote locations.

We are just working real hard in Ohio with our $7 million grant award to help us develop a Olocal system with other partners in the State of Ohio.

But, Senator, as innovative as is work in Ohio, there are barriers to successfully achieving the goals of "Jobs: Ohio's Future."

Categorical programs simply cannot achieve comprehensive service. We must simplify the system to improve administrative efficiency and eliminate prescriptions of how to provide service. Ohio citizens want simple, customer-friendly help accessible in a variety of ways when they need it.

But although such systems must be locally designed, a patchwork of different programs operating in different parts of the State without consideration of statewide needs will not make for an effective system overall.

We need legislation that allows states and localities the opportunities to combine resources and tailor programs to meet our needs.

How can you help us? Legislation is required to consolidate programs and eliminate fragmentation. Funding has to be simplified in a way that provides flexibility to states. Please do not consolidate programs, cut, and then leave us with a categoric programs to administer with less dollars.

Republican governors have included in their statement of principles a single Block Grant with a single purpose established.

Governors should oversee those grants as he or she sees appropriate. Governors should ensure strong private sector and labor organization participation, and support local and State agencies responsible for service delivery within mutually negotiated frameworks between the State and local officials. Many other states have governors who agree. In fact, one of the republican governor's principles states just that.

So, we believe there should be one grant—a training grant, which consolidates all general training programs with an integral employment grant financed from "fire walled" FUTA funds that employers pay and which consolidates employment programs, emphasizing job placement, veterans' re-employment, expanded labor market information, unemployment insurance administration, and economic development. This allows a governor to include employment, training, job placement, unemployment insurance, and economic development in a unified State system.

Republican governors also recognize these FUTA issues in their principles, and they are standing tough on those issues.

Governors should have the authority to use the discretion in identifying the agency or agencies charged to carrying out these activities, but ensure linkage between unemployment insurance and re-employment services. I was so delighted to hear Bill Hanigan talk about those.

Such a system should also be State based and designed to meet local needs, and delivered within a framework negotiated between State and local partners as is the case in Ohio and its Customer Service Centers and One-Stop systems.

No consolidation or simplification can be done, as you know, without concern for public accountability. I could have talked at length about our performance at OBES: How we get unemployment checks on time, how our job matching has increased in productivity; and how our costs of job placement, a good value at hundreds, not thousands of dollars, have continued to decline.

I could tell you about our JTPA system's achievement, with its 30 local partners, of standards of nationally recognized performance.

Republican governors' principles reflect accountability in their treatment of Block Grants. Governors, say the principles, should be required to provide Congress and the Administration with periodic reports describing the extent to which the expenditure of Block Grant funds has resulted in, among other things, substantial increases in the education and skill levels of the existing and future labor force, and the employment of workers.

Senator DeWine, I know you are interested in how you can directly impact new aspects of S 143 legislation. Thank you for your

interest. I would like to say again that you have been a real champion on Ohio's behalf. I am aware and grateful that you, the Chairman, and her Labor Committee staff are engaged in ongoing discussions with governors' workforce representatives; but there are a few things I would respectfully like to ask you to consider in your deliberations about the bill before the committee.

First, I would like you to clarify exactly how revenue dollars will be used to carry out core services relating to job search, placement assistance, and labor market information.

Second, I encourage you to allow states to move toward providing Olocal services without binding arbitrary timetables.

Third, I would like to ask you to seek broad benchmarks and outcome measures for accountability, rather than establishing narrow and confining standards.

I understand and appreciate the difficulty in determining roles of local partnerships and other things, and I would be happy to lend assistance based on our experience.

I can also appreciate that governors are not the only interested parties involved in this process, any more than I would expect that heads of employment security agencies like mine would be the only parties. But the Chairman, whose father was a governor, recognizes the importance of listening to governors as the most conspicuous employment and training and economic development officials in their State.

Governors are held accountable for the success or failure of the workforce policy, and must have the final authority for developing and implementing a system that fits a state's needs.

Thank you again for listening to our suggestions. We are delighted that you are here.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. Miss Bowland, let me just stop at this moment and ask you a couple of questions.

Let's take a 19-year-old male inner-city kid, 5 years behind in math, 5 years behind in reading, reading at a sixth or seventh grade level. One parent in the home. That parent has been on drugs. This 19-year-old individual has very low self-esteem.

If the Block Grant goes through, as you two have envisioned it, what will Ohio do to help that particular individual?

One of the concerns that I have, frankly, is that I believe the biggest problem facing this country today is the growing number of our young people who match the description I have just utilized. There are some people who believe that if Block Grants go the way that some people envision them, that the states will simply ignore that individual. It will be too expensive to help that individual.

There are allegations that, basically, what the states will do is take the individual who is the easiest individual to train, or retrain, or help to find a job, or who is between jobs, and spend $1,000 or $1,500 on that individual, but not spend the 5,000 or 10,000 or 20,000 that it may cost to get that 19-year-old I just described in a situation where he or she can function and be a productive member of society. I would like to get both of you to comment on that.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Basically, the problem is they do not deal with that young man right now. We do not provide welfare benefits to

a 19-year-old male without any children. They are sort of left out there by themselves.

I firmly believe we could put together a program—Miss Bowland and I talked about this. There are several counties looking at doing some pilots—and maybe even the State. We were trying to do a few things around the State in this area to put our programs together in a Olocal situation.

We want to begin assessing people up front so instead of having a Human Services Department or area or office that you would go into, you go into a career opportunity place, or whatever you want to call it; and where we triage—I call it triage—people, where we could put people in a different program, even if we could attach some of our educational programs to that and try and help the people with all sorts of things.

Maybe we both give them a welfare check, but we may give him some job training, if possible. Some remedial education is probably what he needs to begin with.

We have some other programs that the department deals with in trying to deal with minority males in a situation, those who have fathered children, and get them in those types of programs.

There are many different things we have going on; and if we could begin consolidating to assess people and put them in the proper place, we may be able to help them.

I have hard core unemployed people I am dealing with. I do not think that is a big issue, particularly looking at some of the rates that welfare reforms are asking for.

Ms. BOWLAND. I agree that what we should be doing is looking at a system where when someone enters that system, whatever is available to that person in the State of Ohio needs to be available to that person.

In our Olocal System we intend to have no wrong door people can enter. At various places in the system you can access all of the services in that system.

For example, one of the things that would go on now is something called proper filing, and that is when someone walks in the door to receive unemployment insurance and that person is referred to training or active search for work.

And there are intensive styles of teaching in that One-Stop system that has integrated services, common intake, and common job developments and can easily provide the kind of access to whatever system that young person would need.

So, whether that young person would need training, a job, supportive services, they can find that without being confused about where to find those services.

We are really excited about the kinds of things going on here. We have core services from the State level; and in addition to that, each local partnership then provides local services around each of those Olocal Systems.

So, be it veterans' services, or legal services, child care or transportation needs, each local community designs a system that is important for them around that core of systems.

I think that is why it is so important for us to leave some flexibility so we can provide services that are designed to meet the needs of the states and each local community, just the flexibility

we need to provide those services in a common sense way of doing business.

Senator DEWINE. Do you envision either contracting out or directly running any kind of residential program?

Ms. BOWLAND. I think that is one that can be considered. I think that there is one that is functioning at a Federal level.

Senator DEWINE. You say is a function being carried out?

Ms. BOWLAND. I think what you are asking about is Job Corps.

Senator DEWINE. Not necessarily Job Corps as we know it. I guess I didn't hear either one of you say or indicate the intensity of the resources to be applied to that particular individual that I have described. Maybe that is just not something that you think the State should do. I guess that is what you are saying, but—am I misunderstanding what you are saying?

One of the things the committee is looking at is Job Corps, so I do not think we should assume the Federal government will do that.

It may turn out the job survives and moves on and changes somewhat; but even Ohio, with three Job Corps sites, we are only dealing with, my guess is, a very small minority of the population that fits into the description that I have just given. And even with three sites, we have more sites than many states do.

How do we deal—what does society do with this hard core—with individuals who, for any number of reasons, are way, way, way behind? They are not just a little bit behind, they are a long way behind. And they are a long way behind for many, many reasons.

We can all supply our own reasons for that, but the fact is that is the situation. What does society do for these individuals, because this Congress is looking at, not only, as you know, not only job training, but job enhancement; and we are looking at complete welfare reform.

This Congress is tackling more issues than any Congress has ever tackled in my memory, so it seems to me this is one of the big problems we have. So, we would welcome your comments or your advice, because you are the ones that will have to get the job done.

Mr. TOMPKINS. The individual described, in our system. They can get food stamps. Along with food stamp, we have a Federal program that deals with employment training. What we want to do is try to take all our subsistence stuff and tie it into work.

In other words, unless you work, you do not get. That is one thing. But a lot of these folks need responsive services. Just to do that is not enough.

I think what Miss Bowland talked about is trying to get all the services together. We want to work with United Way and the other types of community activists and work together and provide a continuum type of thing that that individual needs.

I think you are right, we need to hit that segment of the population; and if we do not, that is who we are going to depend on in a lot of ways in the future. We need to work with that population.

I think it also means starting earlier. We work with the kids before they get to be 19 years old and try and provide programs and things through this whole mechanism we are talking about. We are talking about taking these kids and doing things like making sure

they stay in school by making some requirements on them to be in school. Particularly teen parents, and all of those types of things.

The more you give us flexibility, the more we can take all of the mismatched things and put it in there. As long as we are local partners, then the intensity is there. The intensity of the community will be a lot more than the intensity outside the community; and that, to me, tends to be outside the problem sector. It was not a part of the system or a place to be.

Maybe in some instances the State, some states—I do not know if Ohio will—will look at some type of residential program.

We have, as you know, several that are closing down now; but maybe we can change the emphasis on our foster care system and other things that takes these kids.

Probably a 19-year-old might already have been through foster care part of his or her life during that time period. How do we get them either into a proper home, or maybe we need to look at some other type of facility. I think those are the decisions the State has to make is what is the best way to do it and what is the most cost effective way.

Ms. BOWLAND. I also think the only way to deal with young people with problems is to do it on a personal level. I would just like to do a personal experience. I sat in last year on the Ohio awards for participation in the JTPA, and one of the things that happened is we sat down with participants early before the awards and we talked with those folks; and we said, well, what is it that helped you in JTPA and each of these folks had incredible problems, incredible problems to work out; and every one them said it was the folks who talked me through it and said how can we help you get in this morning?

So, I am not sure the only answer is a residential program. I think each State should be allowed to have the flexibility in the system to meet their own needs.

Senator DEWINE. Let me very quickly turn to one more issue because this issue has been raised with me by a number of people who have come in to see me; and that is the concern on the Block Grant, about how the states would deal with disabled Americans, and whether or not they would get lost in the Block Grant. Maybe you two could comment very quickly, if you could, on that.

Ms. BOWLAND. I do not think any portion of our workforce is going to be lost in our system. At the Governor's Human Resource Development Council, every single constituent involved in that system will be involved in designing this system.

I think what I hear, perhaps, is distrust of people in the state; and I think people designing systems for their own constituents need to ensure that we have the kind of qualified employers that we need, employees that we need, to ensure that we have the kind of training we need and that will really meet the needs of our citizens.

I do not know of anyone who can better design the system. I do not think anyone wants to segregate out people based on any kind of characteristics. I do not think those fears ought to be involved in the designing of that system. I think everyone should be assured of that within their own State system.

Oh, by the way, there are all sorts of laws and stuff we have to comply with to ensure that doesn't happen.

Senator DEWINE. Let me turn, if I could, to the chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, Miss Hairston.

Ms. HAIRSTON. Thank you very much. I am very happy to be here and see you again. Let me begin with a personal perspective. I am a native Ohioan, born in the small town of New Lexington, in Perry County in southeastern Ohio, on the edge of Appalachia.

I grew up there during the 1950's during a time when coal was king and strip mining was the major employer and driver of the local economy. It was no surprise then, when my high school class graduated from high school in 1962, that many of its members went to work in the coal mines. What was more unusual those days was that I went to college.

My classmates earned good wages for their work and were able to rear families in the dignity that comes from being good providers. Their worlds crashed when strip mining stopped; and ultimately, Peabody Coal Company ceased operation in that part of the State.

My friends had no skills beyond those directly related to mining. Faced with personal economic crisis, many of them turned to area community and technical colleges, as well as branches of Ohio's universities to help them retrain and ready themselves for new kinds of work.

They enrolled in Muskingum Area Technical College, Hocking Technical College, and in the branches of Ohio University, recognizing that low-skilled, high-wage jobs of Ohio's mid-century were gone and that they needed more training to compete.

Their story has been repeated all over Ohio as the steel mills closed along the Ohio River and businesses re-tooled and restructured to compete with international markets.

These Ohioans voted with their feet by enrolling in community and technical colleges and changed their lives for the better.

Today, Ohio's two-year colleges and Ohio's high schools are weaving a 4 year curriculum called "Tech-Prep" designed to prepare vocational students to move forward with additional technical training after high school. It will provide them with the advanced skills necessary for today's workers so that they may not experience the plight of my former classmates.

Ohio's two-year colleges are partners in job training, in the JOBS Program, with the Department of Human Services by providing education and training to those on public assistance, so that they, too, may be productive contributors to the economy in the future. And these campuses utilize Perkins funds to train disadvantaged and displaced workers.

As the skill threshold required by businesses and industry continues to rise and to change, the task of preparing a highly skilled workforce is one that Ohio's higher education, especially within the two-year college sector, has enthusiastically embraced.

Ohio's 54 two-year college campuses represent a ready-made and comprehensive delivery system that is close by and responsive to local needs. These campuses have the technological capacity to prepare skilled employees; and they have developed a special empha-

sis and expertise in the area of servicing businesses, industries, and adults already in the workforce.

This is a vitally important role since 75 percent of those who will be part of Ohio's workforce in the year 2000 are already in the workforce, often in small to medium businesses in which training opportunities are limited.

Ohio's two-year campuses are currently meeting a wide spectrum of workforce training needs. Specifically, they are:

First, linked with secondary education in Tech-Prep and School-To-Work models;

Second, providing Certificate and Associate Degree programs in areas of high demand;

Third, providing customized training to meet the specific needs of business and industry;

Fourth, providing education and training and job retraining programs for special populations such as welfare recipients.

You will hear today, as you already are beginning to, of other governmental sectors that are helping people become contributing citizens. Our challenge is to find ways to harness the collective power of all of these efforts to serve well and to use resources wisely.

Clearly, the picture is panoramic in its sweep. Ohio has an abundance of job training in its educational system. There are multiple programs for students ranging from basic skills, employability and job readiness to advanced technology training and continuing professional development opportunities.

Other programs focus on the employer and the needs business and industry have for an educated and trained workforce.

Still, other programs focus on special populations such as the underemployed, displaced workers, or welfare recipients.

According to Windows Of Opportunity: A Directory of Workforce Development Programs in Ohio, there are 15 State agencies responsible for 51 workforce development programs.

How, then, do we improve where we are? Individual, high-quality job training and education programs abound here; but the development of a systematic and comprehensive workforce training system is just beginning and needs incentives to develop fully.

A vision of statewide collaborative possibilities is especially emerging through the work of the Governor's Human Resource Investment Committee and the interagency Memorandum of Understanding for Ohio's School-To-Work endeavor. But, a comprehensive nonduplicative, clearly-defined, agreed-upon set of models that addresses both student preparation and the need for continuous worker training is not yet a reality in Ohio.

Such a system would provide a coordinated, integrated set of educational and training programs responsive to:

1) the current workforce, underemployed, displaced, underskilled;
2) the future workforce, those still in our school system;
3) the expanding needs of businesses and industry.

The system would provide linkages between education levels. It would integrate job training programs, providing the continuum of education and training needs, and recognizing the drop-out and drop-back-in pattern of education that today's workers will evidence continually throughout their work careers.

Clearly, all stakeholders must collaborate to succeed in the enormous task of putting in place a world-class statewide system of workforce education in Ohio. Life-long learning truly is no longer a catch-phrase.

What, then, is the role of the Federal government?

Even as we are working hard with our colleagues here at this table, there is a substantial and unique role for the Federal Government in job training at the State level.

First, the Federal Government has a major organizational role to play. It should assist states in developing a comprehensive workforce and job training system such as the one I described earlier.

The cornerstone of a new strategy for more effective job training should be a committed partnership among the Federal Government, State government, local private sector, colleges, and school districts.

Federal funding, whether through some version of Block Grants or other formulas, should mandate close collaboration among all involved in workforce education to ensure a seamless system of education and training opportunities.

This approach does not favor one provider above another. It taps the best attributes of all to build a system based upon quality.

Second: The Federal Government can play a critical role in allowing States and localities the flexibility to design programs to meet unique needs at the local level and by stressing collaboration among service providers. Two-year colleges, for example, can use Federal and other external funds to in turn leverage additional resources to better serve small and medium-sized companies.

Third: The Federal Government could insist upon accountability requirements that assure the best and most effective use of resources for job training. Such accountability requirements should be strategic and long-term in nature.

Education and training service providers should be challenged to identify and track meaningful, long-term results as effectiveness indicators, rather than the more easily measured immediate outcomes.

For example, long-term results in economic development, business vitality, and the ability to remain self-supporting, tax-paying citizens who add vigor to the local economy are better indicators of the true benefits of the effective education and job training than counting initial placements in jobs that are all to often dead-end, minimum wage, short-term placements.

In summary, the Federal Government can assist States by allowing all providers to stand on their own merit while providing individuals real choice in selecting the education and training option that best prepares them for the world of work.

In summary, in its best form, job training would be a rationalized, collaborative system that would use demonstrated effectiveness for the worker in the long-term as a measure of accountability. It would encourage partnerships in order to get the best possible service for the customer. It would have ease of entry and exit, focusing on the lifelong need to have competitive skills.

We believe that Ohio's two-year campuses are a vital, integral component in this service and call upon the designers of the Federal reform to use this resource to its full capacity.

As you give thoughtful consideration to how to fund and improve job training systems in states, I would ask that you consider the integral role that two-year colleges must play as part of such a system.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share these thoughts and concerns with you. We really appreciate the opportunity to have had a change to talk to you about this today.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. Let me turn to the Ohio Department of Development.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Senator, thank you very much. It is a pleasure to be here today. The Ohio Department of Development is working with companies that are looking to locate or expand in Ohio. One of the key resources that the companies are looking for as a part of any incentive program is worker training.

The Department of Development and the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services has created a unique partnership. Whereas, part of the incentive package is to offer workers who have received training services by the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, having a highly educated and trained workforce is the best way that our companies can maintain a competitive edge in global economy.

Governor Voinovich has taken a lead in this issue by creating the Governor's Human Resource Investment Council to work toward creating that high employment workforce.

The Department of Development, I am pleased to say, is one of the participating agencies, along with all those here at this table together in that effort.

Worker training is so important that in the last year it has been estimated that 47 states, roughly—some of the states have spent in excess of $359 million on State premium programs, many in the form of incentives in the way of attracting business when they are relocating.

In 1994, private industry spent in excess of $50 billion in training programs. At the Ohio Department of Development, one of the programs that we administer, The Ohio Industrial Training Program, has had approximately $9 million per year spent on it, or roughly 10 percent of our department's budget annually.

The Ohio Industrial Training Program was started in 1980, and was designed to provide financial assistance and resources for customized training involving employees of new and expanding Ohio manufacturing businesses and will consider industries of other natures creating a large number of jobs.

Over the past fiscal year, the Ohio Industrial Training Program funded approximately 165 companies worth $9.3 million with approximately 22,000 trained or retrained workers.

The success of the Ohio Industrial Training Program lies in its ability to foster the local and regional economic development efforts.

This is done by linking Ohio public educational systems—including vocational education, technical, and universities—and the needs of industry by acting as a broker of source specialized training.

In other words, we spend some of those dollars from some of the agencies sitting at this table to interact with the Ohio Industrial Training Program.

Financial assistance is available from the Ohio Industrial Training Program on a reimbursement basis for a portion of training and expenses incurred.

Examples of some of these costs are construction costs, materials, and special needs for special, unique types of training.

One of the unique aspects of the Ohio Industrial Training Program in comparison with some of the other states is that we work—excuse me a moment. A unique aspect from other states' training programs is that we work with both new and existing companies, treating them equally. Some other states focus solely on the efforts of attracting new business with their training programs.

The Ohio Industrial Training Program is also a partner to various specialized programs and training, including the Appalachian Industrial Training Program, which matches funds to support training for companies located in the 29 designated Appalachian towns.

OITP is also a partner in the Ohio School-To-Work program, which consists of high school students participating in apprenticeship programs. OITP reimburses companies for their apprenticeship costs and receives $500,000 to study the potential for the statewide School-To-Work program to move forward.

The Ohio Industrial Training Program also offers various other programs to participants in the JTPA, along with Ohio Unemployment Services for the economically disadvantaged. Partners at the local level are able to help and assist us in our training consortiums, which we use to help and assist local communities and businesses in their efforts to train,-and retrain employees.

The programs are helping in driving the economic engine of Ohio. The good news is we feel that the Ohio Industrial Training Program is working very well in conjunction with private industry needs.

The mid-year edition of the Society National Bank newsletter contained the following quote about Ohio:

Few states possess Ohio's commitment to the future and willingness to invest today for long-term results. Support for the job training and education at the state's public and private educational facilities offers the State an invaluable resource for an educated workforce and technological innovation.

I think that is a testimony and an outside validation for how the agencies at this table have worked together to try and provide training for our existing companies, as well as new companies that may want to locate here.

These words that we have talked about and those quoted are powerful words, and I think it will take all of us here at this table, and many more partners in the private sector, to ensure Ohio continues as our national economy expands.

If we continue work and have the most well-prepared workforce, our economy will continue to expand and grow as we move into the next century.

As we look at the Ohio Industrial Training Program with the Ohio Department of Development, we feel one of its main successes

and one of the main reasons it has been successful is because it is a customer-driven oriented training program.

It is for training or retraining that is directed directly by the employer who is already existing or planning on locating in Ohio. We feel this private sector driving of that employment initiative is very important.

Senator, as you address the job training reform proposal that this Nation faces now, we would like to encourage you to consider as part of the portion of those funds that you are going to allocate for those types of training programs be considered as one that is driven by the employers.

One of the ways we thought about and talked about that that could work is you can give tax credit for employers that would drive them for specific training and bring them together with the universities and colleges with that training and that initiative.

We feel it is very important that the training that goes on be driven by the private sector and that is has those job opportunities available for those people.

So, we encourage you to look at some of those aspects as you deliberate on this very important issue. I thank you for the opportunity to be here, and we look forward to being of any further assistance.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. Let me now turn to John Goff of the Ohio Department of Education.

Mr. GOFF. Thank you. I am very happy to be here. I provided testimony for you and so I am not going to read all of it. I will just hit the highlights.

You have heard a lot from some of my counterparts here regarding the cooperation we have had going on over the past several years in the work programs. The Ohio Department of Education took very seriously the report, America's Choice: High skills or low wages, which calls for improving the educational and workforce develop programs in this country.

Our department has taken that very seriously as we have worked within the range of Schools-To-Work; but, specifically, our programs for vocational education.

Ohio has a very strong vocational education program. It is one of the premiere programs in the Nation. We are part of the Governor's Human Resource Investment Council that has been driving the initiative to develop a comprehensive School-To-Work program; and in addition, we have been heavily involved in the technology program with the Ohio Board of Regents.

We are also working with the Board of Regents in the total notion of articulation of what happens when the students transit into the workforce, back to the institution, and how we can collaborate better on that effort. We see ourselves trying to provide a continuum of services for the young people coming through the program.

What I would like to concentrate on basically here is the notion of preparing young people as they come through our K-through-12 system, hopefully, some day, so we can diminish the need for other kinds of programs my partners have talked about here at the other end of the spectrum.

I know that is difficult. There is no question you have to deal with those presently at-risk or who need the services we have

talked about; but we truly believe that unless we can start a system that runs K-through-12, we will not be able to address long-term solutions to these problems.

Ohio has 30 percent of our students enrolled, that are in the eleventh and twelfth grade, enrolled in vocational education.

We also have the largest enrollment in the Nation in career education. A very significant part, we believe, of a competent School-To-Work program.

Our statistics would show that students who graduate from our programs are employed; a high percentage of them are in programs where they were trained, and their unemployment rate in the future or now and in the future is lower than even what you would find for the normal population.

Ohio is involved with, at the present time, with 24 Tech-Prep Consortia that involves 35 colleges, 320 secondary school districts; and we have 410 business/industry labor representatives involved with us in that process.

We are trying to improve and have made substantial progress in improving the academic end of those youngsters going through our vocational programs. We have done that in a number of ways: Enhancing, for example, the occupational competency profiles or skills lists where we develop the profiles or skill lists for 62 separate occupations; and we involve 585 business and labor industries in helping us to do that.

In addition, we have been even involved in the ACT work team program, which focuses on applying math, locating information, applied technology, and reading for information.

That culminates, we believe, and has in our program for vocational students in what we call the Career Passport. It is much more than a transcript. It includes those skills and competencies that youngsters can take out into the community, to the secondary higher education institutions; and it is now in the process of being designed for all students.

We believe that is essential and is more than just for vocational students. All kids ought to have a Career Passport that enables them to make life transitions in whatever choices they make.

We believe our agency has a great deal to contribute to the School-To-Work initiative. We are involved in our students' career plan, which leads to a Career Passport; and we have been a part of the Memorandum of Understanding, which outlines those responsibilities that our agency and the other key agencies of State government is going to engage in as we try and put the program together.

Finally, what role should the Federal Government play? I guess I would outline several things for you. We believe that State government must also play its role in the process; and however the funding comes from the Federal Government, the requirement that the State provide a maintenance of efforts and an administrative match to Federal funds, we believe, are critical to us being a true partner in the process.

We believe the Federal Government can help us in trying to portray to the citizens of this Nation the need for a high-skilled workforce.

In my work around the State, I am not really sure all of our citizens really understand the changes taking place in this Nation and in this world and the need for a high-skilled workforce for all of our students.

I believe that leadership can also be provided by enabling us to develop and supporting us in developing a common credentialing system that is portable across the country.

As we move up to the Great Lakes States under the leadership of our Governor, the leaders in this Nation are trying to do-that within the Great Lake area, but it needs to be across this country.

We also need to continue to work to put together our School-To-Work system and our Tech-Prep System and all the components of the School-To-Work program and work there at the Federal level.

We are very committed to making sure that the K-through-12 system becomes an integral part of a total system, that we not acting alone, that we are partners in the process.

We appreciate the opportunity to be here today. Thank you.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. Let me turn finally to the Administrator of the Ohio Rehabilitation Commission, Robert Rabe.

Mr. RABE. Thank you. As you indicated, I am the Administrator for the Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission, which has primary responsibility for helping people with primary disabilities become employed. I work and am directly responsible to seven commissioners, who are appointed by the Governor; and under current State law, four of those commissioners have to be people with disabilities.

During the last year, the Vocational Rehabilitation Program was a tremendous investment in Ohio's labor force. More than 4,000 individuals went to work with competitive jobs at competitive wages, averaging $6.36 an hour.

These results were achieved because the Federal Government and State agencies worked in partnership with local communities to develop a statewide program of customized services.

This customized approach is the key to the program's success. Vocational Rehabilitation specializes in providing combinations of physical restoration, education and training, job development, workplace accommodations, and employer support services, all of which lead to employment of people with disabilities.

Approximately 26,000 people with severe disabilities are receiving services from the Rehabilitation Services Commission and its community partners.

I believe that it is clear to everyone that an individual who is employed is in a better position to become independent than someone who is not working and is being supported by public funds.

Ohio's Vocational Rehabilitation Program is putting people who have generally not worked before into the workforce and into meaningful jobs that results in true independence.

We have approximately 160 community partners, such as the Vision Center of Central Ohio, and Vocational Guidance Service Of Cleveland, which assist in these efforts.

Licensed vocational rehabilitation counselors working for the State, but housed in communities throughout Ohio, guide and co-

ordinate available local services to people with disabilities in all 88 counties.

This joint State and local effort has been developed to assure that people with disabilities have an opportunity to attain skills necessary to go to work. This process has evolved over the past 70 years and assures that an individual with disabilities receives the specialized service that he or she may need.

The source of these specialized services is often the licensed vocational rehabilitation counselor. How do you accommodate a wheelchair user? Where do you access computer equipment adapted for someone who is blind? What job coaching services will help a person with mental retardation succeed? Do you know sign language so you can effectively communicate with a person who is deaf?

The counselor's knowledge and skills are the keys to answering these questions appropriately. The person with a severe disability who works closely with a counselor can develop a plan that will result in long-term job placement.

To bring even more people with disabilities into the workforce, Ohio has developed 13 contracts with local county governments to assist in the delivery of services. These contracts are the only ones of the kind in the country that integrate the local and State delivery systems.

In addition, as has been mentioned earlier, we have cash transfer agreements with several departments, all of which assist us in providing funds for people with severe disabilities.

One such individual is an individual from the Toledo area who is 19 years old, an African American male who became an RSC consumer in 1994. He was convicted of CCW and committed to the Department of Youth Services; and he was developmentally handicapped with a conduct disorder diagnosis and had been suspended from school 22 times, and his immediate family has a problem with alcohol.

James found employment in construction, which he particularly loves, but lost the job when he walked off the job because he wanted a vacation.

The RSC vocational counselors through the Work Adjustment Training Program provided in the local community assisted James in understanding the consequences of inappropriate work behavior. Consequently, James has been re-employed with the same construction company and has worked steadily for the past year.

I believe this is the type of person we are trying to reach out to that is not only at-risk, but someone with a disability.

By developing relationships with employers such as the Ohio Restaurant Association that you heard about earlier, State Savings Bank, we tap into private-sector expertise in job development.

A relatively new program, the Governor's Initiative on Jobs For People With Disabilities, provides an opportunity for local employers to expand their operations and subsequently hire people with disabilities to fill the resulting positions.

Because these programs are statewide, the unique employment needs of people with disabilities can be met in all four corners of Ohio.

These programs are examples of how State initiatives result in services that can be utilized at the local level to stimulate job development.

These joint efforts clearly demonstrate any legislation should include the ability to deliver services through multiple approaches.

Our experience in the case indicates that there is no single answer to service delivery. The provision of services by State agencies, community programs and the private sector have to be coordinated. No monopoly by one sector can exist. No one sector can have all the answers to service delivery questions; and no one sector, working alone, can place all people with disabilities who need jobs into appropriate employment.

All of the programs I described above are possible under the current Act. Future legislation should be written to permit these programs to continue. But does this mean the current service delivery system is perfect? It certainly does not. It can and should be improved. Title I of the Rehabilitation Act consists of 78 pages of overly prescriptive language that often does not enhance the quality or quantity of services delivered in Ohio.

For instance, the current Act requires that each State spend one and a half percent of its Federal allotment for strategic planning. In Ohio, this amounts to one and a half million dollars. While I do not disagree we need to plan, if we can do it cheaper than that, we should be permitted to do so and use the remainder of funds for direct services.

Attached to my testimony is our recommendation for a streamlined Title I. These two pages provide an outline for the delivery of job training services for Ohioans with disabilities and reduces the burdensome Federal regulations which emphasize process rather than outcomes.

Section 6 of the document places the most emphasis on outcomes: The number of people placed in jobs, the wages earned, and the amount of time the person remains employed are the most important aspects of job training program. This amended Title I could and should be integrated into any job training legislation.

In my written material are other examples of burdensome regulations. The Federal Government should guide States and hold States accountable for outcomes, not for process. How each State arrives at the agreed-upon destination should be left to the decision of the Governor and State legislature. The Federal Government should establish broad guidelines to assure that individuals with special needs are able to receive assistance from any delivery system.

The Federal Government can approach its job with minimal prescriptive regulations and should only provide descriptive direction.

In summary, people with disabilities have an unemployment rate of 65 percent. These individuals require specialized services to go to work and be independent. In Ohio, they are receiving these services and becoming employed. We certainly would agree that we need to work together to achieve these outcomes.

Again, we are happy to be here, Senator, and are willing to answer any questions you have.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much. I appreciate your specific suggestions that are attached to your testimony. I think it

would be appropriate if I gave the opportunity to respond to comments made earlier in a previous panel by Lisa Corbett. Were you here?

Mr. RABE. I was here for part of her comments, yes.

Senator DEWINE. Will you respond to that?

Mr. RABE. I believe, Senator, in any governmental system there are opportunities for excesses to happen; but, I believe that overall, and I think in part of the comments that were made, there was recognition that there are a large number of caring individuals who are committed to providing adequate services.

I think within the current process that there are opportunities for people to work together, both people with disabilities and individuals who are rehabilitation counselors.

As I indicated earlier, a minimum of four commissioners I work for have to be people with disabilities and currently we have five commissioners and one parent of an individual with a disability.

So, I think the commission in Ohio exemplifies the philosophy that was mentioned in terms of having people with disabilities in charge of the program.

I think the concern that I have is that many of the burdensome regulations that a rehabilitation counselor has to provide in the form of information are part of the program. When someone comes in and wants to get training to to work, you have to fill out multiple forms and documents, multiple pieces of information for that particular individual.

I think that part of what we are looking at is the fact that certainly some of that could be reduced and then the interaction and funds available to persons with disabilities would be increased.

Senator DEWINE. I wonder if any of the other witnesses have any additional comments that they would like to make to close the hearing today?

Ms. BOWLAND. I would like to make one. One of the programs that I administered at OBES is the employment service system, which is labor market information.

One of the things that I have kind of stressed in these kinds of hearings, and I would like to again, is those programs are not training programs. They are dedicated employer tax dollars, and they do provide universal labor exchange systems.

I would hope that as Congress is making those determinations that that system already paid for and already taxed, it be used as a program in a universal system for placement of training programs; and I hope serious consideration is given to that. Thank you very much.

Ms. HAIRSTON. Senator, I would like to put in an extra strong word for what I feel is an effective program; and that is the efforts made in the Tech-Prep area. We have found growing partnership with the Department of Education and also engage many of the communities in this. I think this is just starting to take root and make a difference.

Senator DEWINE. All right. I want to thank this panel and all of the witnesses. I notice some stayed for the whole hearing, and I want to thank everyone who came.

The timing on this hearing, I think, is appropriate. We have been looking at this area now in our committee, and I have been looking

at it for the last several months; and I have travelled around the State of Ohio and talked with a number of people, a number of experts in this area and people who are consumers and people in the field; and I would just encourage anyone who is here who has any additional comments that they would like to make, or any thoughts they would like to share with us, to do that.

Our committee is scheduled next Wednesday to begin the mark-up of a bill and continue on—it has been postponed, I guess. The way Congress works, you never know what is going to happen; but I would encourage all of you to get us the information.

Dwayne Sattler, who works directly for me, is your contact in my office; and we would like to get that information.

So again, I would encourage all of you to share any thoughts you have. I know a number of you. As I watched the audience and watched some reaction to the statements made, I saw agreements and some disagreements and that is fine; but I would like to encourage you to share that information with me.

[Additional statements submitted for the record follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KENT KAHN

Thank you, Senator. I am Kent Kahn, State director in Ohio for Green Thumb, Inc. Green Thumb is a national nonprofit organization established almost 30 years ago to operate our Nation's first older worker employment and training program under Operation Mainstream. Through the years, the program evolved into what today is known as the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) authorized under Title V of the Older Americans Act, administered by the U. S. Department of Labor, and operated by 10 national grantees and the Governors of each State.

I commend you, Senator, for convening this hearing in preparation for the Senate Labor and Human Resource Committee's introduction of a job training reform proposal. We believe the SCSEP should not be one of the programs targeted for consolidation under the Work Force Development Act of 1995 for the following reasons:

The SCSEP is not a job training program. Throughout its 30-year history, the program has emphasized the dual goals of service to local communities and subsidized employment for low-income older Americans who are unable to compete in the local labor market. While program operators are encouraged to coordinate with job training programs and to provide limited employment related assistance to eligible individuals, the primary nature of the program remains community service employment.

Excluding the SCSEP from the Work Force Development Act would not compromise the integrity of the new integrated system or open the door for other groups to claim an exception. You can continue to indicate that job training programs for older people will be included in the proposed workforce development system since the bill includes the JTPA II-A Older Worker Set-Aside, that is our country's job training program for older adults. The justification for excluding the SCSEP is simply that the primary goals of the program are community service and subsidized employment, and not job training. Consequently, the SCSEP should more appropriately be evaluated in the context of Older American Act reauthorization instead of job training reform.

The SCSEP is critical to local communities and low-income people, particularly older woman and those living in rural areas. The SCSEP is essential to the provision of important services. Libraries are kept open so children can read, frail older people and children receive care, seniors and homebound persons receive nutrious meals and children benefit from SCSEP participants as mentors and tutors. The SCSEP serves the oldest and poorest in our society, and those most in need: 39 percent of enrollees are minorities, the highest minority participation rate of any Older Americans Act program; 72 percent are female; 32 percent are age 70 and older; 81 percent are age 60 and older; 41 percent do not have a high school education; and 9 percent have disabilities.

Through the SCSEP, they earn minimum wage to help pay for food, housing, and other basic necessities, while making valuable contributions to their communities. In many rural communities where Green Thumb operates, the SCSEP provides low income seniors with their only opportunity to work. Where will these seniors and their communities turn if they do not have Green Thumb?

The SCSEP is a key component of the Older Americans Act (OAA) and should remain part of that Act. To remove the program from the OAA as part of job training reform would undermine critical services provided by and to seniors in Ohio and across the country. Many nutrition programs and other services for seniors are dependent on labor provided by the SCSEP.

The SCSEP is a program that is working and working well! Unlike many other government programs, we have measurable goals and results, and those results consistently exceed all goals established for us by Congress and the Department of Labor. The SCSEP has consistently exceeded all goals established by Congress and the Department of Labor, surpassing the 20 percent placement goal for the past 6 years and achieving a record 135 percent of goal in FY 1993–94. Virtually all appropriated funds are spent each grant year, in stark contrast to similar programs. Why restructure or consolidate a program that is a model for others and upon which approximately 100,000 Americans depend for their independence and self esteem?

The SCSEP is our country's only workforce development program designed to maximize the productive contributions of a rapidly growing older population through training, retraining, and community service. History has taught us that mainstream employment and training programs like JTPA and CETA are not successful in serving older workers. A targeted approach is needed.

The SCSEP is primarily operated by private, non-profit aging organizations that are customer-focused, mission driven, and experienced in serving older, low-income people. These nonprofits work in close partnership with the Governors, Department of Labor, aging network, and employment and training system, actively participating in One Stop Service initiatives designed to streamline and integrate services.

The SCSEP provides a positive return on taxpayer investment. One study found that the programs returns at least $1.47 for every dollar invested by empowering individuals to become self-sufficient and productive members of their communities.

The SCSEP is a means tested program, serving Americans age 55 plus with income at or below 125 percent of the poverty level, or $9,200 for a family of one. The program serves less than 1 percent of those who are eligible; long waiting lists are common in most areas of the country.

The SCSEP ensures national responsiveness to local needs by directly involving participants in meeting critical human needs in their communities, from child and elder care to public safety and environmental preservation. The SCSEP has been a major contributor to national disaster relief efforts, most recently resulting from floods in the midwest, hurricanes in the southeast, and the California earthquakes and riots.

The SCSEP has demonstrated high standards of performance and fiscal accountability unique to government programs. Less than 15 percent of funding is spent on administrative costs—one of the lowest rates among federal programs and despite a unit cost that has not been adjusted for increased administrative expenses since 1981.

The SCSEP has historically enjoyed strong public support because it is based on the principles of personal responsibility, lifelong learning and service to community. In addition, the program is extremely popular among participants, host agencies,employers, communities, and the membership of our Nation's largest aging organizations.

Federal block grant proposals are accompanied by immediate and significant funding cuts, in addition to spending caps on future funding that do not allow for inflation. In addition, its politically easier to cut and eliminate block grants than categorical programs. Consequently, the SCSEP and other aging services programs will be reduced at a time when our population is rapidly aging and the need for services is growing.

Governors will be given extremely broad discretion to determine whether to fund certain aging services programs and how those programs shall be operated. Governors will be able to change the current aging service delivery structure, and many have promised to do so by consolidating aging services into a broader social service delivery system. This will substantially weaken aging programs, particularly if they are required to compete with programs for other targeted groups such as youth.

Many Governors and State officials don't consider employment, training and community service for older people to be a priority. Consequently, in those States, the SCSEP runs the risk of being funded at substantially lower levels, or not being funded at all.

A number of Governors may choose to have the Employment Service or another State agency administer the SCSEP, rather than keeping the program with other aging services programs under the State Unit on Aging.

The program will lose the valuable national stability, leadership, and advocacy that national grantees have provided. Through the years, the national grantees have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

been instrumental in securing legislative reauthorization and additional funding for the program. They have worked closely with the States to ensure the equitable distribution of resources. And they have provided important stability and continuity during times of political change.

Our country will lose the significant investment that it has made in the SCSEP over a 30 year period. The SCSEP saves limited taxpayer dollars by empowering low income seniors to be productive in their communities rather than dependent on welfare and other costlier forms of public assistance.

The SCSEP will be subjected to greater political influence, detracting from its central purpose. Each time the Governorship of a State changes, the SCSEP and other aging programs will be at risk. Even though the current Governor may be supportive of the aging services network and the SCSEP, we have no assurance that the next Governor will share the same views.

The efficiencies of the current system, which operates primarily through direct grants to national, nonprofit aging organizations, will be lost under the State bureaucracy of a block grant system.

The formulas for allocating SCSEP funding will change under a block grant system. The new formulas could dramatically shift resources from one State to another by eliminating the grandfather clauses previously enacted by Congress.

Historically, block grants have not served rural people and disadvantaged Americans well because they are not large constituencies with significant political influence.

The SCSEP is operating effectively and efficiently to provide needy Americans with community service employment, communities with essential services, and employers with quality workers. We strongly oppose the inclusion of the SCSEP in the Work Force Development Act, particularly at a time when our older population is booming and more and more seniors will need this program to escape poverty.

I appreciate your leadership in tackling the difficult issue of job training reform. Obviously, this is a matter of great importance to us, and to the people whom Green Thumb serves in Ohio and 43 other States.

As you consider future legislation, I ask that in addition to excluding the SCSEP from the list of programs being considered for consolidation and block granting, you also include provisions to ensure service to low-income seniors particularly those in rural areas. As you are aware, mainstream employment and training programs historically have posted a dismal record of service to older Americans, and we have little confidence this will change absent the establishment of appropriate guidelines and program oversight. In addition, it is observed that block grant resources tend to flow heavily to urban and suburban areas, to the detriment of rural people whose need for service is often greater. Consequently, steps must be taken to ensure an equitable level of service to rural communities.

I would be happy to provide you with any additional information that you might need as you face the tough decisions ahead. I would also welcome the opportunity to testify at any additional hearings on job training reform or the Older Americans Act.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide this information to you and your committee. Green Thumb will continue working with you to ensure that needy older Americans receive meaningful community service employment and that essential services are provided to the communities in which they live.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BILL BUSSEY

My name is Bill Bussey, director of adult education in the Eastland Vocational School District, Groveport, Ohio. This testimony is on behalf of the Eastland Vocational School District, Adult Education Division and the Postsecondary Adult Vocational Education division of the Ohio Vocational Association. I will be addressing the topic of the job training system.

Question 1: What is the current status of the job training system in Ohio?

Ohio has two State-supported job training delivery systems for adults. One is supported by the Ohio Board of Regents. The other, by the Ohio Department of Education. We believe that there is a place for both systems in Ohio. Both are very successful in training adults for the workforce and helping them develop a career. We are making attempts to work together to encourage and minimize any perceived duplication of efforts. The postsecondary adult vocational education, supported through the Ohio Department of Education, utilizes available resources and stretches the taxpayer dollars. This occurs by utilizing the joint vocational and city school districts' facilities and equipment during the day and evening hours. These facilities and equipment are used by secondary students during the day. By utilizing them

for adults, the equipment and facilities do not sit idle during the summer or when secondary students are not using them.

Programs supported through adult vocational education are very cost effective. The full-time career training classes are supported financially by the Ohio Department of Education and through tuition paid by adults. The financial support of the Ohio Department of Education only partially pays for the cost of the program. However, through this support, tuition is able to be kept at a reasonable cost for the student. Many students have employers pay for their tuition or they are eligible for financial aid through Pell Grants, grants provided through the JTPA, human services JOBS programs, BVR and other agencies. East land Vocational School District, Adult Education Division trained 236 adults in full-time programs during the 1993–94 school year. Of these 236 students, 89 percent were placed in civilian-related employment, and 99 percent are currently employed. In other words, these adult student completers are now taxpayers instead welfare recipients. These results are similar to many adult vocational education programs throughout the State of Ohio.

The money received at Eastland Adult Education from the Carl Perkins Act allows us to provide for support services such as assistance for financial aid, counseling, and job placement. Eastland, as well as other schools in Ohio, provide continuing education classes for those looking to upgrade their skills. Adult vocational education also provides customized training for those businesses and industries in need of employee training.

Ohio has developed 35 full-service centers conveniently located throughout the State. Serving both the public and private sectors, the centers offer: job assessment, employee testing and assessment, technical skill training and upgrading for individuals, customized training for employees, seminar development, career counseling, job placement, financial aid assistance, childcare and transportation assistance. These full-service centers, as designated by the Ohio Department of Education, were nationally recognized as one of the Skill Centers by the Bush Administration.

These full-service centers and other adult vocational education programs in Ohio not meeting the requirements of full-service centers are deeply involved in agency and business/industry linkages.

The assessment/evaluation program Interagency Agreement has allowed 17,000 adults to participate in 35 schools in 65 counties. Over $4 million has been assessed to help these individuals. The JOBS tuition agreement enables ADC JOBS participants to move from welfare to work through participation in postsecondary adult vocational job training programs. Over 8,000 participants have been served in over 48 different schools with nearly $3 million used to assist these JOBS clients. There are also many linkages with JTPA and private industry councils throughout the State. The latest initiative, the One-Stop Career Centers, is a priority in Ohio. Adult vocational education is a key provider of services in the current and future One-Stop Career Centers.

Question 2: What needs to be done to improve the system?

All agencies, organizations, and businesses involved in the job training system must be encouraged to collaborate. The One-Stop Career Center is a good beginning for this. However, before decisions are made, one must look at who provides the best services for intake, counseling, assessment, training, and placement. In many areas, the adult vocational education arena is able to meet these needs. We can improve by increasing and improving our marketing methods so that many more are aware of what we can provide.

The job training system needs to be more convenient. Again, the One-Stop Career Center will help in these endeavors.

The State and Federal leadership must allow for creativity and flexibility in programming for job training. They must also be supportive of legitimate training ideas yet to be implemented. Leadership must come in the form of finances and in the form of creative ideas.

Business and industry linkages must be improved. A good example is the industry education alliance in Ohio composed of Eastland Vocational School District, Adult Education Division, the central Ohio Builders Industry Association, and the National Association of Home Builders. This alliance is providing a carpentry qualified framer class for many adults in central Ohio. Twenty to 30 students are trained each year to be qualified framers and are being placed with contractors and subcontractors to build homes. However, it is through the initiatives of both the educational system, the 81A, and private employers that this alliance is successful.

Additional financial resources must be available to improve the training offered in postsecondary adult vocational education. In many cases, teachers are not paid as much per hour as secondary instructors. In order to get and keep qualified, competent, instructors, this must change. In addition to this, we must improve the

teacher preparation for adult education instructors. At the current time, there is no system in place to provide teacher preparation for adult vocational educators.

Question 3: What role should the Federal Government play in job training?

The Federal Government must invest in workforce development. A study should be completed to identify successful programs. We feel that postsecondary adult vocational education as well as secondary vocational education in Ohio is much different than that of the rest of the nation—we are many steps ahead, in my opinion.

Secondary and adult students are being trained and placed in jobs which provide a good living and allow for them to move up the career ladder. These programs in Ohio should be duplicated throughout the rest of the country.

The Federal Government must also invest in State leadership and administration activities in Ohio.

Collaboration must continue. The Federal Government must provide and encourage collaboration efforts between agencies, businesses, organizations, and service providers. Again, the One-Stop Career Center is a good initiative toward this end but, again, we must be sure that adult vocational education plays a major part in this One-Stop Career Center.

Last but not least, the Federal Government must be sure that special interest groups and agendas do not dominate. Accountability is essential. The Federal Government should do a study in Ohio to see what works.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LARRY H. WEBER

While there is no strong constitutional mandate for Federal involvement in education, there is a mandate for promoting the general welfare. I will make the case for promoting the general welfare through funding of postsecondary adult vocational education. Specifically, I encourage Federal investment in postsecondary vocational education's effort to:

1) stimulate economic development through customized training and services for employers, and

2) provide job market-sensitive training to America's workforce, and

3) facilitate the welfare-to-work transition.

In short, I will provide a rationale for Federal funding of postsecondary vocational education while explaining the role and value of the same. Then I will offer some suggestions on how to improve the federally funded job training delivery system.

*Stimulating Economic Development*

While corporate welfare has recently been villainized by budget cutters, the Federal Government must do something to level the international playing field for our employers. All developed and most developing countries continue to provide direct and indirect aid to business enterprises. Providing public funding through public educational institutions is one way of balancing these two conflicting issues. It avoids direct government support to specific industries or businesses with its inherent conflicts. It allows for locally discerned needs and opportunities to be met. Finally, it helps America's workforce by making it more productive and marketable without the hardship of funding training through debt or reduction of savings.

*Providing Job Market-Sensitive Training*

America's workers and dislocated workers need time- and cost-effective training. Focused, job-oriented courses which can be completed in less than a year are a must. The above criteria define postsecondary vocational education in Ohio. In a general sense, this means non-college careers. It is well established through several studies that by the year 2000, only 17 to 23 percent of all jobs will require college training. During this same time, it is expected that the growth in the percentage of jobs requiring advanced vocational or technical training will continue. The United States is preparing too many people for college jobs while neglecting the largest segment of employment—skilled occupations and trades. Federal seed money is the best way to help reverse this trend.

*Facilitating the Welfare-To-Work Transition*

Welfare reform is a hot topic. Nearly everyone agrees that the welfare system encourages dependency. While structural change is needed in the current welfare system to break the dependency syndrome, no real change will occur unless attractive job opportunities can be accessed by recipients. Training is one necessary component in facilitating this access to satisfying job opportunities. Welfare reform will fail without job training. Postsecondary adult vocational education is expert in serving this population.

Some suggestions for improving the job training delivery system.

1) Funding distribution and management



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Providing a more direct funding path to adult vocational education providers would increase efficiency. By eliminating separate entities or bureaus for managing Federal dollars, bureaucratic red tape, delays and overhead would be reduced. In Ohio, the Department of Education would be an excellent manager of these funds.

2) Block Grants

Use of block grants would be helpful, especially in Ohio. In Ohio we have a somewhat unique and highly effective dual delivery system for providing vocational and technical education to adults. As well developed and successful as the vocational education system is in Ohio (secondary and postsecondary), it often is neglected at the Federal level since there are so few States structured in this way. Ohio lawmakers and government officials are aware of the value of postsecondary adult vocational education and are more likely to make wise funding decisions. Furthermore, block grants without great regulation should be more cost-effective.

3) Tech Prep

Improve the Tech Prep initiative by encouraging inclusion of postsecondary adult vocational education institutions. An example of how Federal Government fails to support successful State and local efforts is the exclusion of Ohio adult vocational education facilities from the language of Tech Prep. Adult vocational education should play an important role in meeting the goals of Tech Prep. Please do all possible to put adult vocational education squarely in the Tech Prep framework.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PEGGY KELLY

My name is Peggy Kelly, displaced homemaker coordinator at Springfield-Clark JVS and president of Ohio Women Work! Ours is a membership organization, rooted in the displaced homemakers movement, dedicated to empowering women from diverse backgrounds and assisting them to achieve economic self-sufficiency through job readiness, education, training, and employment.

The Senate is currently in the midst of considering vocational education and job training reform. It is essential that, as crucial decisions are being made, the needs of women, girls, and their families are not abandoned in national reform efforts. *Programs which have historically succeeded in serving women and girls must be maintained in any national vocational education and job training system.* The lack of a strong and specific commitment of Federal funds will marginalize women and girls at the State and local level.

*Background*

Ohio has approximately 40 displaced homemaker/single parent programs serving 2,500 individuals annually. These programs are supported through sex equity and displaced homemaker, single parent, and single pregnant women funding earmarked in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990. These provisions in the Perkins Act were carefully crafted in recognition of the critical need to ensure women and girls access to quality vocational training that leads to economic self-sufficiency.

Programs funded under the Perkins provisions provide an array of support services designed to meet the special needs of women and girls and help succeed in vocational education, particularly in non-traditional courses of study which lead to high-skill, high-wage jobs. Services include: expanded outreach; personalized career counseling and support; skills training and job preparation; coordination with related agencies; and subsidized tuition, dependent care, and transportation assistance.

For the 11 years that the displaced homemaker/single parents provisions of the Perkins Act have been in existence, programs have proven to be life-changing, transformative experiences for women and their children. Programs offer families a chance to achieve economic independence. Through these family empowerment programs, displaced homemakers and single parents can find the resources necessary to move from unemployment to a high-skill and high-wage job, from economic dependence to self-sufficiency, from single parents to family providers.

*Programs Holy Rated by Customers*

How customers assess the value of service provided by government programs is an issue that Congress has said is central to decisions about continuing support for programs. This past summer, graduates of displaced homemaker/single parent programs were asked to assess the service that they had received and they gave their unqualified approval![1] More than four out of five people who participate in displaced homemaker and single parent programs say their experience with the program has been "very good" or "excellent." Of the more than 6,500 graduates nation-

[1] *Satisfaction Guaranteed: Customers Speak Out on Displaced Homemaker and Single Parent Services.* A Report on the Findings of a National Customer Satisfaction Assessment. Women Work!, Washington, DC, 1995.

ally who responded to the survey, more than nine in ten would recommend the program to a friend because of the profound effect it has had in helping them achieve self-sufficiency.

Three out of four customers who participated in other government programs rated their displaced homemaker or single parent program "much better" or "better" than such government programs as welfare, unemployment or JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act).

*Federal Role Essential*

Continued Federal leadership in assuring that States provide services to displaced homemakers and single parents is absolutely essential. The Senate should recognize that if left up to the 50 States, it is highly unlikely that the voices of displaced homemakers will be heard. Displaced homemakers are individuals who are going through major life changes, faced with searching for a job after years as homemakers caring for their families, working hard to keep to a minimum the disruptions in their children's lives. These women probably will not be at the table when State legislatures or governors are making decisions about job training programs.

History has shown that States have not responded to the needs of displaced homemakers and single parents. Prior to the passage of these provisions in 1984, a National Institute of Education study found that less than 1 percent of all vocational basic grant money was spent for displaced homemakers, support services for women seeking to enter nontraditional fields, and child care. A recent National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education report[2] showed that three fourths of local programs surveyed did not receive any funds outside of the Perkins provisions. State administrators of the programs were unequivocal in their belief that displaced homemakers and single parents would not get services without Federal requirements.

As the vocational training system is restructured, we urge members of the subcommittee to maintain the Federal commitment to providing vocational training to women and girls by retaining the provisions for displaced homemakers and single parents currently included in the Perkins Act.

Senator DEWINE. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 1:45 p.m., the committee was adjourned.)

[2] *Empowering America's Families: Documenting the Success of Vocational Equity Programs for Women and Girls*. National Coalition on Women and Girls in Education. Washington, DC, 1995.

ISBN 0-16-047455-8

9 780160 474552 90000